BOSTON UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

THE INFLUENCE OF CURRENT INDIVIDUALISM ON THE FAMILY, WITH SOME CONSIDERATION OF INDIVIDUALISM AS EXPRESSED IN THE RUSSIAN FAMILY

by

Mildred Virginia Muhly
(B. S. University of Minnesota, 1922)

submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
1932

Ser.

Table of Contents.

I

Introduction

In the thinking of today there is probably no subject which has received more attention than the family. It has been the subject both of concern and of unfavorable criticism. It has been attacked from several angles: the rising tide of divorce, flaming youth, birth control, marriage and careers, and so on. There are those whose eyes are turned to the past and who wish for the "good old days." Some people say that the family is disappearing altogether. They point to Russia as an excellent proof of their thesis.

Regarding the criticism that is being directed at the family, there are several things that should be said.

In the first place, the great masses of people are basing their judgment on sensational and sordid literature and amusements of the same type. Crowds of individuals read nothing but the daily paper, and an equally large number confine their attention to the daily tabloids. With one or two exceptions, the daily papers feature murders, divorce, breach of promise suits and the like. The plot of the average movie is no more elevating. Under these circumstances, the happy family is poor material. Much of the current criticism of the family, then, is based on an unfair presentation of the facts.

In the second place, the lamented "good old days" were not so ideal as they are pictured. Memory has the happy faculty of not retaining unpleasant images; furthermore, memory errs. "The revolt against old-fashioned family life is normal, when one considers what it was. Not only

[illegible]

have its positive evils stung our generation into rebellion, but the most characteristic factors of our own economic order has made it incredible that the dead head of the past should rule the modern family."[1]

In the third place, critics and alarmists confuse cause and effect. They believe, for example, that divorce is a cause for the break-up of the family when in reality it is a result. They harangue at length on the present confusion of marriage and divorce laws in the United States -- a convenient subject for such discourse -- and advocate uniformity and tightening of the laws.

There can be no doubt that the family is changing. It has had to change. It does not maintain a separate existence; it cannot be regarded as an independent sphere of social behavior. New inventions, the centralization of industry, and the general speeding up of life have made changes in the family inevitable. These changes have come more slowly to the family than to other social institutions because tradition checks the ongoing of the family. "Moreover, the emotional attitude we all take toward family life, especially with respect to the experiences of our own childhood and the binding force which this attitude permits social experiences of the past, produced under different conditions, to exert upon the present family tend to slow down change and prevent each generation from fully recognizing the trends that may be taking place."[2]

It will be the purpose of this thesis to demonstrate that the changes which have taken place in the modern family

1. Harry Emerson Fosdick, "What is Happening to the American Family?" Journal of Social Hygiene, March 1931.
2. Ernest Rutherford Groves, Introduction to Sociology, p. 206.

center around individualism and that, in dealing with the problem of the family, individualism must be taken into account. It is the belief of the writer that the consideration of individualism will make possible a more perfect home-life than has been possible in the past.

The thesis will begin with a brief history of the family. This history is taken from modern competent sources, and seeks to be informative rather than critical. The history will be followed by a consideration of the changes which individualism has brought to the family. The next two chapters will be devoted to a study of Russian family laws. The reason for including these chapters is this: Russia is the extreme illustration of the application of individualism to family life. Whatever conclusions are drawn from this study have been based largely on sociological and psychological considerations. The history of Russia has not been included within this thesis. The sixth chapter will be given over to the consideration of resources which the family still has and provisions which must be made for developing and conserving them.

In this thesis, the terms"marriage" and "family" will be used in the meaning with which it is used by Groves and Ogburn.

> "Marriage in the narrow sense is the legalizing of a special relationship between a man and a woman, to which society gives its sanction ---- Marriage is more commonly used in a wider sense to denote the relation between the man and woman who have entered wedlock. In this sense marriage represents the simplest form of family. ---- Marriage with this significance is frequently hard to distinguish from the family. Indeed the two terms commonly overlap as we use them in our speaking and writing. Nevertheless, when used precisely, each emphasized a different quality of relationship. Marriage concentrates upon the

> association of husband and wife with reference to the significance of the fellowship for each of them, while the family conveys the idea of a more complicated level of adjustment in which husband, wife, and child each has individual significance."[1]

The family therefore is more than a group of individuals living together. It is "an organization of attitudes and ideals which each family develops indipendently and which characterizes the family as a cultural group."[2] It is identification of interests which makes of the family a cooperative unit. Chase Going Woodhouse, in a study which she conducted of factors making for successful family life, found that, when money was a source of worry, it was not the size of income that caused worry, but the attitude of husband and wife toward family matters.[3]

So long as this cooperation and organization of attitudes exist, the family is a unit. When the ambitions and ideals of the individual members become differentiated however, the family complex breaks up and family disorganization has begun. Marriage and divorce are more than their legal aspects; they are recognition by the community or state that family attitudes have been established or discontinued. Fundamentally, marriage and divorce do not make or dissolve the family. The family is disintegrated usually long vefore a public divorce is granted; just as soon as individual wishes are consistently not subordinated to family attitudes, the process has begun.

In the preparation of this thesis, the writer has endeavored to obtain as recent material as possible. In dealing with a subject of so timely interest, it has been necessary to use some magazines; but only reliable writers and periodicals

1. Ernest Rutherford Groves and William Fielding Ogburn, American Marriage and Family Relationships. p. 3.
2. Ernest R. Mowrer, Family Disorganization, p. 3.
3. Chase Going Woodhouse, "Does Money Make the Marriage Go?" Graphic Survey, January 1932, pp. 355-358

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

have been read. While the writer has had no personal experience in Russia, he has sought to obtain information from the publications of those who have been in Russia long enough and who have a knowledge of the country sufficient to give their judgments credence.

II

The History of the Family [1]

Back to Beginnings

The family is the product of biological, social and economic evolution. Just as man's believing in a Superior Power was not something that man decided to do and then did, so his establishing of a family was not done arbitrarily but gradually. Promiscuous sex relations preceded established marriage. Marriage as a stable institution seems first to have been a matter of convenience - a provision for old age after the freedom of youth. Each change in the family came naturally, as a matter of convenience or in fulfillment of a desire.

If the theory of evolution be accepted, then the human family developed from the domestic group of animals. Many anthropologists have sought to establish the thesis that something closely akin to marriage exists among animals. They argue that the helplessness of the offspring brings male and female together and that, among some forms, mating is for life. Such reasoning unfortunately is not borne out by facts. Anthropologists as a rule are not biologists; for that reason they read back into animal origins the same family organization as is found in human society. As a matter of fact, while it would seem logical to say that "the animal origin of man implies the animal origin of human society,"[2] yet it is practically impossible to discover among animals anything to correspond to the give and

1. Unless otherwise specified the material in this chapter is taken from Robert Briffault, The Mothers.
2. Ibid p. 1.

take of human society and particularly of the family. The evidence among the highest forms of animal life and the most primitive people of today tends to prove that, at the time in evolution when men came upon the scene, the family as a unit consisting of father, mother and offspring had not evolved.

Robert Briffault, in the preparation of his book, The Mothers, made an exhaustive study of all the available material on the subject of the family life among animals. He finds no evidence of the family as it is understood today. The unit in the animal world is the female and her offspring. After fertilization the male may have nothing whatever to do with the female. Even among mammals, the male is not known to take any share in providing either for the female or the young or in rearing the latter. In fact, among flesh-eating animals, the male is considered a model if he refrains from eating the young.

Not only does the female assume responsibility for her offspring, but she enjoys certain privileges. She selects the abode in which she will rear her young. With animals that make their burrows, the female undertakes the task alone, and she may make several burrows before she has one that satisfies. The female is also the leader of the group. She seems to enjoy this privilege because of her superior mentality. Among animals and primitive peoples the female is superior to the male; whatever superiority the man may enjoy along this line in more advanced civilization is due to the fact that he has had more opportunity to acquire knowledge.

There is evidence of but one case of monogamous mating among animals. There is a certain antelope that mates for life. The reason that is advanced for this one exception to a general

rule is the fact that this animal is born in pairs in which there is one of each sex. The bull moose, which is spoken of as monogamous, does not remain with one cow for more than a week and many mate with several cows in one season. Monkeys and apes are without exception polygamous. The so-called "monogamous monkey" of Madagascar is a lemur and lives in bands of from six to twelve. Information to the effect that gorillas are monagamous is dubious. Winwood Reade collected reliable information from African hunters showing that the gorilla is polygamous and that the male frequently is solitary. Others have noted that they travel in bands in which the females exceed the males.

One more characteristic of animal life should be noted, and that is its individualism. In the animal world, with one or two exceptions, the give and take of cooperation is not the rule. In a flock of birds that apparently presents such a perfect picture of unanimity of action, each member of the flock is looking out for himself. The accumulation of large numbers of birds in rookeries and breeding grounds is the occasion for strife and competition, not for concerted action. Similarly the pack is a temporary affair for purposes of food-getting. Kipling's Jungle Book was written out of a rich imagination, but the story of the observation of "packlaw" is contrary to facts.

As soon as one speaks of the lack of cooperation in the animal world, he is reminded of the apparent contradiction in the case of social insects. Among these insects, there is an elaborate organization, but its only purpose is reproduction. A peculiar situation exists in which the female who bears the young has no care for them. That responsibility rests upon the

workers, to which are denied all the other pleasures of maternity. In other words, the social life of insects centers around the sex urge; it is not cooperation for the benefit of all. In the interpretation of insect life, man has been governed by that deep bias which leads him to interpret biological and social phenonema in terms of the social and sentimental traditions of the human family. Insects seem to have developed off on a different line from the vertebrate stem of animal evolution. If that specialization for purposes of reproduction that is found in insects had been carried along in the stream of evolution, the sex urge would probably have become so overpowering that civilization would not have been possible.

The Primitive Family

In tracing the development of the human family the method employed is that of studying peoples who today exhibit various stages in family evolution. The most primitive tribes then probably illustrate the type of family found among the first human inhabitants of the earth.

In view of what has been said before, it is to be expected that the family unit in the lowest civilizations would be the mother and her offspring, and such proves to be the case. Marriage cannot be said to be the result of the helplessness of the offspring, for, in the most primitive society, the husband is neither the natural provider nor the protector of the wife and children; those functions are fulfilled by the wife's brothers. In fact, the presence of a helpless offspring is often the cause for the husband's leaving the wife. Among the North American Indians, a man left his wife because she was nursing a

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

child and married another, and a woman left her husband after she knew she might expect no more gifts.

Westermarck has said that "marriage is rooted in the family and not the family in marriage."[1] It is true that the Jews consider the sterility of a marriage sufficient reason for its dissolution. Westermarck's hypothesis, however, is based upon the theory that the family is patriarchal in origin, and the facts do not bear out such a theory. The argument that the family came into existence to protect and support the offspring seems to have no force.

Neither can marriage that is permanent enough to be called by that name be said to have had a sex basis. Sex relations among primitive people are promiscuous. Among many tribes in the lower cultures, marriage is said to take place as soon as puberty is reached. This so-called marriage is so transient that it is often difficult to distinguish it from casual sex relations. The younger the parties to the marriage the shorter its duration. The Sakai of the forests of Malaya have been cited for their monogamy and the regularity of their sex relations, but as a matter of fact a sexual union may be dissolved within a few days or weeks and a new one formed. It is nothing rare among the forest tribes of Malaya to meet young men who have been married forty or fifty times. If an Eskimo finds his wife a virgin, he may reprove her mother therefor. In youth and young manhood and womanhood, marriage is frequent and decidedly temporary.

The marriage customs of the Australian aborigines, have been the subject of much study. A curious situation obtains:

1. History of Human Marriage, 5th ed. rewritten, V. I. p. 72.

individual permanent marriage is confined to the old men. In some tribes, a man is forbidden, even on pain of death, to marry before thirty. The inference is that a man marries a wife, the native replies: "In order that she may fetch wood and water and prepare food." In other words, marriage is a matter of convenience. The man is the hunter; the woman provides the comforts of old age. Such a permanent marriage, however, is very uncommon.

Just as the female of the animals chooses the place of abode, so does the wife in primitive civilization have the home. The husband comes to live with her for a period of time. This custom seems to be universal. Because the home belongs to the female, she takes delight in doing the work connected with it. The African woman wades mud to cultivate her land; the Indian woman of the American Southwest builds her house. To the outsider, it seems as if the husband were tyrannizing over his wife, but the situation is quite the opposite. Inheritance through the woman is a part of matrilocal marriage. A man's children, therefore, are not of his line, but his sister's children are.

In those chvilizations where marriage has become more permanent and monogamous, the husband becomes a resident in the wife's home and serves her brother. Among some tribes there is a modification of matrilocal marriage, in which the groom serves the bride's family for a number of years, after which he and his wife are presented with a home of their own. This custom is found in certain parts of Siberia and China. In the Patani States of the Malay Peninsula, the young couple is required to spend the first fortnight in the bride's home.

Among our own people, this custom remains in the habit of eating the wedding breakfast in the bride's home.

The custom of the husband's serving his wife's father in order to obtain the privilege of removing her to his own home is called "marriage by service." The Biblical account of Jacob's marriage is an example of marriage by service. Even after a girl has left her parents home, the tie which binds her to it remains close. Among African tribes, the wife returns home at the first signs of mistreatment, and missionaries despair of fixing permanent family life on the people.

The economic factor was responsible for the change from matriarchal to patriarchal marriage. In primitive cultures the woman domesticated grains because they related to food preparation, and the man domesticated cattle because that job was considered to belong to the province of the hunter. With the domestication of cattle came a pastoral society. Men acquired wealth and when they acquired wives were able to substitute money for service. Consequently they purchased their wives and, because they were financially able, they purchased many. In the Bible, the patriarchs of pastoral society, of which Abraham is an example, were heads of clans made up of wives, children, and other relatives and servants. Polygamy and marriage by purchases are associated with a pastoral society. In such a society, woman loses her economic value. Marriage assumes a purely sexual aspect, and woman, deprived of all but her sex value, devotes much time to personal adornment.

In Europe, marriage did not pass through the pastoral stage but changed directly to agricultural and industrial culture. Lands were inherited by women because, in matrilocal

society, they were in the hands of women. Moreover, lands did not lend themselves to dividing up as did herds. If there was too much division, the shares were too small to cultivate. Therefore, monogamous marriage became the rule. The chief purpose of marriage was that "the heritage should not be left desolate and the name cut off." The Athenians offered a dowry as an inducement to men to marry their daughters. Hence marriage by dowry is as difinitely associated with an agricultural society as marriage by purchase is associated with a pastoral society.

Marriage in Historical Civilization

The accounts of the Semitic family in the Bible would seem to indicate a patriarchal origin. One thinks of Abraham and his flocks and his wives. However, there is evidence that the practice of matrilocal marriage was universal among the ancient Semites; in fact it has survived down to the present day among many of the wilder African tribes. Jacob's service for Rachel has already been mentioned. The oldest writing in the Old Testament, The Song of Deborah, represents the Hebrew tribes under a female 'judge.'

In Egypt the change from matriarchal to patriarchal society went on from first to last but never completely effected. Many elements of pre-patriarchal society survived. Functions of royalty in ancient Egypt were regarded as being transmitted in the female line. An Egyptian princess was born a queen, but a man became king only by coronation and then only by becoming the consort of a queen. Descent was reckoned through the mother. All children belonged to the mother, and

there were no illegitimate children. When a woman married she remained in her home and was visited by her husband, who might have several wives. In marriage contracts, which were not religious but economic, the husband pledged obedience to his wife. Whether single or married, from the earliest age, a girl or woman had the fullest legal rights and could enter independently into any transaction.

Marriage in the heroic age in Greece was more matriarchal than patriarchal. Children belonged to the women. Virginity was not required of a bride. Plutarch said that the Spartan women ruled over their men; the Spartan Penelope is not representative of her sex. Women gave their names not only to their children but to their families, clans and tribes. Ionians and Dorians traced their descent from Helen, the daughter of the Moon; she was the true ancestress of the Hellenes. House property belonged to the woman and descended in the female line. Marriage by service was the rule, for the purpose of obtaining a woman with land.

Athenian marriage never became, even in historical times, thoroughly patriarchal. Although the Athenian wife removed to the home of her husband, she remained for all juridic purposes a member of her parental household. A wife had no claim whatever on any of her husband's property, all of which might at his death go to a distant relative; at the same time, a wife, whenever she left her husband or he died, took back the whole of her dowry. The woman was tied to the land. In order to obtain the land, it was necessary to marry an heiress, but patriarchal law dictated whom she should marry, - her nearest male kinsman or whomever the will dictated.

Gradually Greece changed from a matriarchal to a patriarchal society. Then the position of women became the most degraded and abject to be found in any civilized country of the Western world. The contrast between the position of women in the heroic age and their position in historic Greece is very marked and difficult to explain. The slavery of the wife seems to have begun early in Greek history.

In Rome, partiarchal society was strongly established. The Romans considered that they were the only people with whom absolute patriarchal rule of the father as head of the family was, properly speaking, fully developed. They considered that in no other civilization did the fathers have so much power over their sons; "pater potestes" is a characteristic of Roman family life.

The word father means owner, master, possessor. The Roman patrician therefore was an "owner of slaves." Women were subservient to their fathers or, in the case of the father's death to their nearest male relative. When a woman married, she transferred her allegience from her father to her husband. Marriage was a civil ceremony. "Only when Christianity had gained a firm foothold in pagan Rome was the dogma of the sacramental nature of marriage taught to the people -- a doctrine for which there is little support in the teachings of Christ."[1]

Toward the end of the Roman Empire, laws were passed limiting the power of the patriarch. In the reign of Augustus, a son was authorized "to dispose by will of any property he had acquired in the exercize of his duties as a soldier."[2] Hadrian extended this law to include all men who had been honorably

1. Willystine Goodsell, Problems of the Family, p. 384.
2. Ibid, p.42.

discharged from military service. "From this time on, the tendency of the Emperors to limit the authority of the father became marked."[1] After years of paternal rule, individualism was beginning again to assert itself.

There were two reasons for this tendency to curb the power of the patriarch. "During the first century of the Empire, the theory of a "natural law" grounded in justice, which should serve as a pattern for civil legislation, was becoming widely accepted among thoughtful men."[2] Another influence was Christianity, which preached the equality of all men before God. Christianity sought to develop the gentler virtues among its members.

Marriage in the Christian Era

Influenced by the sordid and licentious mode of living that developed in Rome as a result of prosperity, and guided also by the teachings of Paul, the early Christian teachers preached an ascetic ideal. They preached that sex in any form was unclean; one should marry if he must, but the married state was not praised. Leslie Weatherhead, in his book, The Mastery of Sex Through Psychology and Religion (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932, p. XVIII), has expressed the early Christian attitude toward sex thus:

> "The end of the world was at hand. A new order was about to begin. The flesh belonged to this world. It was evil. Sex and sin were synonymous. So Christianity grew up with an attitude to sex from which many are not, even now, emancipated."

Women were to be subservient to their husbands. Joyce Hertzler has said that his idea of subservience comes from the rib story of Genesis."[3] These teachings, backed by an institution having

1,2, Ibid, p. 42
3. Social Progress, p. 437.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the influence and appeal of the Church, have persisted until the present. They have created a complex in people's minds that militates against the happiness of marriage.

Mediaeval chivalry put woman - if she was wealthy or of royal blood - on a pedestal, but it gave her little power. Moreover, it had no consideration for the masses of women.

Down through the centuries, until the Industrial Revolution, the large percentage of the people lived in the country: it was an agricultural era. The family was self-supporting and performed six functions: affectional, economic, recreational, protective, religious and educational. Home industries in the cities were organized into guilds. Under the guild system, the wife took a responsible position in the family industry. The vigorous women of Elizabethan times conducted business in their husbands' absence.[1]

In colonial days, there was a strong economic motive behind marriage; it was the most practical thing to do, and outside interests did not allure. Marriage was legal rather than religious. The father was the head of the house. Women such as Ann Hutchinson who dared think for themselves were looked upon with great disfavor. It never entered into the thinking of either husband or wife that marriage could be anything else than life-long, and all members of the family suppressed individual wishes, - if indeed they had them - which if expressed might have tended toward the disruption of the family group.

The Industrial Revolution took away woman's economic importance in the home. First the production of thread and

1. Beatrice M. Hinkle, "Changing Marriage: A By-product of Industrialism," Survey Graphic, December 1926, pp. 286-289.

the territory and around of the Sioux, here remained until the present. They just created a question in society which that all likes reading the territory of territory.

Political activity is known - if one can easily or equal blood - on a concept, and it was one little every society, it had no consideration for the people of women.

Less number the economies, until the textural industrial, the large percentage of the people lived in the country. It was on agricultural era. The family was sustaining and performed six functions: affectional, economic, recreational, protective, religious and educational. Some activities in the cities were organized into guilds. Today the guild system, the city has a responsible position in the family industry. The vigorous women of Elizabethan times associated business in their minority members.[1]

In colonial days, there was a strong economic motive behind marriage; it was the most material thing in life. The marriage laborers did not alone. Marriage was least entire from religious. The Pilgrim was the head of the house. Women and the unmarried men lacked their from themselves and lived each with great dignity. It never occurred into the minding of children concerned to with that marriage could be anything else than life-long. And all members of the family recognized individual wishes. - If looked they had than - which if marriage and didn't have thought towards the disruption of the family union.

The industrial revolution took away women's economic importance in the home. Just the production of items for

1. Reference to Ibid., "Changing the Image of Women of Industrial Age," Young Phoebe, December 1969, pp. 1-2.

cloth was taken from her. Successive inventions have taken other duties from her. When industries were taken out of the home, women followed to perform the same work in a factory. Furthermore, the factories created a demand for cheap labor, and women and children supplied this demand. For those women who went outside the home to work and become wage-earners, the Industrial Revolution brought economic independence.

It is rather interesting to note, however, that, whereas the Industrial Revolution brought economic independence to some women; it brought parasitism to others. In the general upheaval attendant to the Revolution, those women who had been active in the guilds were left behind. They were not fitted for factory work, and there was no provision made for their education for professions. Their knowledge had been of a practical nature. It became the rule to require University degrees for different types of work, and women were not allowed in schools. Even mid-wifery was turned over to men. The idea that women should be supported by their husbands gained ground. Capitalism brought ease to many women; they became merely spenders. That artificial standard which dominated nineteenth century social life was set up: "there were certain God-appointed laws determining the proper sphere of women; her interests and capabilities were considered to be totally different from mans."[1]

The hundred and fifty years since the Industrial Revolution have brought an important change in woman's status. When schools for women were opened and women were admitted to coeducational schools, the intellectual leaven began to work. Intellectually, woman had the opportunity to become the equal

1. Beatrice M. Hinkel, op. cit., p. 286-289.

of man. Education was the first step in "the application of democracy beyond the legal confines to most of the relationships of live, including those between the sexes.[1] The sweeping away of religious restraints has been a further step in the emancipation of women. Granting freedom to women has made it possible for them to achieve economic independence. Marriage is not so necessary to them as it once was.

III

The Influence of Individualism on the Family

The Emancipation of Women

Perhaps the most obvious expression of individualism today is the emancipated woman. Her growing independence is the cause most often advanced for the break-up of the family. In the past, the

> "greatest hardships of marriage have been borne by women who because of their numerous children and their legal infirmities, were dependent and helpless. That is the reason perhaps that now, on account of their new-found consciousness of themselves and their dawning individualism, women appear to be the active agents in the modern disruption of marriage."[1]

In the past, marriage was held together by the economic dependence of women and children upon man. Now, since women can support themselves otherwise, and have the advantages of cultural and professional education, marriage has lost in popularity and significance. The freeing of women from the bondage of their husbands is a development which civilization has brought.

> "It is a fairly well established fact that a positive correlation exists between a highly developed civilization and a low birth-rate; but the evidence of a similar correlation between culture and the marriage rate is not so clear. Our knowledge of ancient society in the Orient does not substantiate the theory, but there is ample evidence in its support in the case of the Roman Empire. Here the proofs are abundant and unequivocal to the effect that, hand in hand with the progress of culture, the spread of wealth and luxury and the development of higher education, in which patrician women shared, there went a continuous decline in the marriage rate. So unpopular did marriage, with its attendant family responsibilites, become in Rome that government officials were seriously disturbed by the problem and Augustus Caesar ---- penalized celibacy by statute. ---- However, Tacitus informs us, nearly a century after the passage of the law, that 'marriages and the rearing of children did not become more frequent, so powerful were the attractions of a childless state!"[2.3]

1. Beatrice M. Hinkel, "Changing Marriage: A By-Product of Industrialism," Survey Graphic, December 1926, p 286.
2. Annals (translated by Church and Brodribb), III, 25.
3. Goodsell, op. cit., p. 301.

The Increase of Individualism on the Family

The Industrialization of Japan

Perhaps the most obvious exploration of individualism today is the industrialized scene. The growing industrialization is the main most often observed for the break-up of the family. In this part, the

> "Previous industries of workers were done home by women who belonged to steady workers families and their local territories. Were domestic and daily life. Now in the factory workers are a, in effect of their non-local social areas of industries and family dwelling industrialism. Women appear in the active media in the modern industrialism of workers."[1]

In the part, workers are held together of the economic economic of women and children from the. The, place where can work for domestic economy, and have the variations of national and personal economic, workers are left to consistency and similarness. The trending of change from the towards of family methods is a development which industrialism has brought.

> "It is a fairly well established fact that a positive correlation exists between a highly developed industrialization and a low birth-rate; but the existence of a similar correlation between culture and the marriage rate is not so clear. In knowledge of modern society in the Orient does not substantiate the theory, but rather is much stronger in its support in the case of the Occidental society. Here the people are educated and sympathetic to the effect that, need in mind the old proverb of culture, the spread of wealth and luxury and the tendency of higher education. In which particular [illegible] there exist a continuous drifting in the marriage rate. In unequal did marriage, with its resultant family responsibilities, begins in fact that government officials were actually disturbed by the problem and are [illegible] ---- demanded drifting by statute. ---- However, [illegible] inform us, usually a country where the passage of the law, that [illegible] and the marriage of children did not become more frequent, so usually was the effectiveness of a civilized state."[2,3].

1. Dorothy [illegible]. Thomas, Changing Marriage [illegible] Industrialism. Survey Graphic, December 1947, p. 700.
2. [illegible] Immediately [illegible] and [illegible], [illegible], op. cit., p. 700.
3. [illegible], op. cit., p. 700.

When barbarian hordes swept over Europe, it became necessary to rear large families to recruit a constantly depleted race. Public opinion and the teachings of the Church strengthened this attitude toward marriage and the divorce rate. But civilization has gone ahead and with it again has gone the development of individualism, with the result that men and women alike are choosing a purely individualistic life without the burdens of a family.

Statistics show that, for the country at large, the marriage rate has increased.

> "Not only were there more females married at the age of nineteen years in 1920 than in 1910 (the percentages are respectively 28.6 and 25.7), but at every age, from fifteen to twenty years, more girls were married in 1920 than in 1910."[1]

It is a matter of some concern however that the marriage rate among college graduates has declined. Moreover, it has declined more among women than among men.

> "A study made in 1917 of the marriage rate in Stanford University showed that, of 1000 graduates in the classes from 1892 to 1900, 670 men and 330 women, 73.2% of the men were married, and only 48.5% of the women."[2]

Goodsell gives other figures which bear out this thesis.

Not only has there been a decline in the marriage rate among educated women but there has been a marked increase, both among the highly educated and those who are not, in the number of women who have combined homemaking with outside employment.

Sometimes these women have taken to outside employment in order to give financial help. In a study conducted by the Institute of Women's Professional relations of 568 married college alumni engaged in paid jobs,

1. Ibid, p. 303.
2. Ibid, p. 305.

The behavior norms which prevail today, it seems, is necessary to keep large families in poverty & economically disadvantaged state. Public opinion on the behalf of the Church attempt/demand this antiquated theocratic monarchy and its dogma and, the activities are made based and with in which are open to development of individuality, with the result that one and other also are according a mostly individualistic life without the consent of a family.

Statistics show that, for the country as a whole, the marriage rate was increased.

"The only area where more females married at the age of eighteen rose is 1969 from 1967. The percentages are respectively 68.6 and 69.7%. But at every age, from fifteen to twenty years, more girls were married in 1969 than in 1967."[1]

It is a matter of some economic measure that the marriage rate among college graduates has declined. However, it has increased more among other less educated women.

"A study made in 1971 of the marriage rate in Hongkong relatively showed that, of 1000 graduates in the class of 1962 to 1966, 791 had had 458 women, 72.9% of them were married, and only 54.5% of one women."[2]

Economist gives other figures which does not also tenable.

The majority that there been a decline in the marriage rate among educated women but there is also a marked increase, but among the highly educated and those who are not, in the number of women who are choosing postponing their outside employment.

Families these women have issues to outside employment in order to give financial help. In a study conducted by the institute of Chinese Studies, relatives of 500 married university graduates surveyed in each year.

1. Ibid, p. 304.
2. Ibid, p. 308.

58% gave economic reasons.
65% with children gave economic reasons.
49% without children gave economic reasons.[1]

Such reasons were given as these: to help the husband maintain present-day standards, husband's poor health, financial disaster, to enable husband to change his job.[2]

"There is nothing subtle in the mental attitude of women forced to work from economic necessity.[3] The women who, without economic pressure, works outside the home is the best example of the emancipated woman. While she desires a home and family, yet she does not find the work of the home to her liking.

> "The married woman who is not a good housekeeper, or who is too uneven in disposition and specialized in her interests to excel as a homemaker, falls easily into the pathway of outside work. She can then gloss over her feeling of incapacity when she compares herself with the expeditious housekeepers and rare homemakers she knows, by reminding herself that her power lie in other directions. ---- To hide from herself her persistent feeling of insufficiency as she sees other women lightly toss off their myriad household tasks and marshall their home responsibilities in orderly, swift-moving formation, the woman inept in the ways of the house or ungracious in meeting the demands of the home rings hard on the various changes of her slogan, 'I must do what I am best fitted to do, regardless of the fact that I happen to be a woman."[4]

That woman is over-sensitive to the reproaches of her family and neighbors, and she is rationalizing. She "has gone just half way in stepping out of the shoes of her mother."[5]

The woman who views outside work as the means of realizing her special ability and who is undaunted by the opinions of others has stepped all of the way out of her mother's shoes.

1.2. Chase Going Woodhouse, op.cit., p. 355.
3. Ernest Rutherford Groves and William Fielding Ogburn, op.cit., p. 59.
4.5. Ibid, pp. 60-61.

This woman's frank facing of marriage, with a consideration of its financial problems and difficulties is illustrated well by what Judge Bartlett of the Reno Court has said:

> "The age of industry, being still in its infancy, is still suffering from sharp readjustments. Each time they come they throw many men out of work and reduce incomes or many others. The girl who marries a poor man or a man with doubtful prospects must face this fact. She usually does, if she has been educated up to a sound perspective on modern economics. ---- If she cannot excape the temptation to live a family life, she marries. If her man has been brought up with the tradition that woman's services are owed entirely to home, she at once becomes a legal slave to the system which governed the life of her mother-in-law. ---- If she puts intelligence and physical freedom ahead of her instinctive desire to bear children, she chooses not to marry and frustrates nature. ---- If she says to her man, I'll marry you provided you let me use birth control, keep my job, and find out for us both whether it is safe for us to start a family at some later date, she is taking a third step, and one that aims to adjust nature to man-made civilization. What she is really doing is subsidizing 'consortium'; that is to say, she is paying a price for a right that her feminine predecessors have always considered life owed them free of charge. ---- The man pays a price too. Instead of a resident manager, he has only a part-time housekeeper;"1 but, he cannot complain too loudly because, as the same writer says, "Women haven't emancipated themselves. Men have done it, with domestic labor-saving devices."2

What have been the effects of the emancipation of women?

First, as to its effect on the women themselves. Women have become more objective and impersonal in their thinking. In the past, their attitude was intensely personal and subjective. To be sure, some women have misinterpreted their liberty. They have regarded it as a licence to do whatever pleased them. They have considered themselves fitted for every occupation that men enter, and they have taken over all the vices of men. Some of them have interpreted freedom to mean time to do nothing constructive but everything amusing: bridge, parties, shopping tours,

1.2. George A. Bartlett, Men, Women and Conflict, p. 234.

and teas. Again, men are partly responsible, because they prefer to support their wives in idleness rather than go against tradition.

> "The true modern woman has a stern sense of equity - she is a sturdy advocate of the 50-50 idea. She values above all things her self-respect, and she knows that it will suffer if her relation is all take and no give."[1]

So far as the effect of the emancipation of women on men is concerned, some suggestion of it has been given already. The employment of the wife away from home may hurt first of all the husband's pride. Then, a wife employed away from home can give only part-time attention to her home. Dr. G. V. Hamilton, in his investigation of a hundred "laboratory cases," - that is to say, 200 men and women - found that the husbands whose wives earned nothing were far more content with their lot than those whose wives worked. 61% of the former were happy, while only 44% of the latter put in the same claim.[2]

Few men look at the emancipation of women in a philosophic light. They do not see what being kept at home means to the woman who has been educated into some other line of interest. Of course it is possible for the woman who works away from home and cares for her home too to become so overtired that she ceases to be a pleasure to live with; but, if she skillfully manages both, she keeps step with her husband.

The emancipation of women has its influence too upon children. If the mother does not spend all her time in the home but is vitally interested in her children, her children may be saved from too much attention. Every child must be thrown on his own resources sometimes. There is a real danger,

1. Ibid, p. 228.
2. G. V. Hamilton and Kenneth MacGowan, <u>What is Wrong with Marriage</u>, p. 80.

however. A woman in whom the maternal instinct is not well-developed may use outside work as an excuse for getting away from her children, and they will not get enough attention. In that case, both mother and child suffer.

Individualism and Family Loyalty.

The growth of individualism has resulted in decreased parental authority and family loyalty. The unreasoned authority of the parents is no longer tolerated. Parents find it difficult to exercise authority over children who are more educated than they. Because the family no longer exists as a unit, it seems as if family loyalty has disappeared. When each member of the family has his independent income or allowance, he becomes to an extent self-sufficient, and there is no tie but affection to hold him to the family.

Individualism and Specialization

Individualism goes hand in hand with specialization. Each person does that for which he is best fitted. For the family this change means that the family is not considered competent to perform all the tasks it performed in the past. Training for life and citizenship is being taken more and more outside the home. If this change does not result in too much loss of contact between parent and child, it is not to be lamented. Those who specialize in a particular work are best fitted to do it. The simplicity of the home is gone; simplicity has gone from all of life. The home must have the assistance of outside agencies if it is to fulfil its functions.

As a result of specialization, the home no longer holds the center of the stage. It cannot compete with

commercialized amusement; even if it can, it does not. It is so much easier to have one's amusements ready-made. To a certain extent, the radio has brought the family together. It has hardly been in use long enough, however, to judge its influence. Then too the family no longer holds the center of the stage because it does not, in any appreciable degree, produce economic goods.

Individualism and Size of Families.

It is a well-known fact that there has been a steady decline in the birth-rate. The following abbreviated table will illustrate that point. (The figures represent the annual number of births per thousand of population).[1]

Years	England and Wales	Norway	France	Germany
1871-1876	35.5	30.2	25.5	38.9
1891-1895	30.5	30.3	22.4	36.3
1901	28.5	29.6	22.0	35.7
1912	23.8	25.8	19.0	28.2
1915	21.8	23.8	---	---

"Sixty years ago, the birth-rate in Australia was about 43 per 1000. In 1916, the birth-rate had fallen to 27 and in 1920 to 25, and it will no doubt continue to fall. In the United States, no accurate birth statistics are available for the country as a whole, owing to the fact that not all the states of the Union require a careful registration of births." There are figures however showing the steady decrease in the ratio of children under five years of age to every 1000 women of child-bearing age (16 to 44 years) in the United States. "In 1800, the ratio was 976; in 1860 it was 714; and in 1920 it had fallen to 467."

1. All figures from Willystine Goodsell, op. cit. pp. 321-326.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

Three causes are advanced to account for this decline: delayed marriages, pathological sterility, and voluntary restriction of births.[1] The second is not of interest here.

Delayed marriages as a cause for the decline in the birth rate are operative in the middle and professional groups. College delays the marriage age of women at least by two years. A woman who trains for a profession desires to practice it, and so she again delays marriage. If she waits for her husband to finish his training, or if they both agree to postpone marriage until they can afford the standard of living they desire, there is another delay. Each postponement decreases the number of years during which the woman can bear children and brings the child-bearing period past the period of her highest fertility, which is from seventeen to twenty-five.

The most powerful cause for the decline of the birth-rate is voluntary restriction of births. There are several reasons for this restriction. Economic considerations are one cause; among the laboring class, this is the most important consideration. A regard for the rights of the child to be well-born is another cause. What is most important to the consideration of individualism, women are rebelling against the idea that their chief function in life is to bear children. These reasons are the products of civilization. --- "they are dictated by common sense, moral responsibility and a regard for personal liberty, none of which are conspicuous attributes of primitive or retarded cultures, but rather of highly civilized nations."[2]

Fortunately today one may observe the influence of

1. Ibid, p. 325.
2. Ibid, p. 328.

individualism on the family in a country where family laws are made with the idea in mind that each person must have the fullest opportunity to express his individualism. That country is Russia. The next two chapters therefore will be given over to a study of Russian family laws and a consideration of their effects.

Soviet Family Laws.

Reliability of Information on Soviet Russia.

In view of the fact that there is a widespread tendency to consider information on present-day Russia unreliable, it may be wise at this point to add a word to what has been said already regarding the trustworthiness of material on that subject.

Since the latter part of 1925, there have been no repressive measures against foreign journalists. Sometimes correspondents whose articles have been considered unfairly biased in a hostile direction have been forbidden to return to the country. One rule of the censorship is that anything may be telegraphed that has appeared in the press. In view of the fact that all newspapers are under government control, this may seem like a hollow concession; but one must understand that, under the plan of "self-criticism," much unfavorable material is published. Since the press is under government control and outside nations are none too favorable to the Soviet government, it is inevitable that there should be some censorship. The commendable thing is that this censorship is open rather than secret. William Henry Chamberlain who lived for seven years in Russia, has said:

> "I think a comparison of the news despatches from Moscow and those sent about Russia from Riga, Helsingfors, Berlin, and other places outside the country would demonstrate beyond any doubt that, despite the handicaps which are implicit even in the mildest censorship, Russia can be reported more reliably than from any foreign city."[1]

The stock idea outside Russia is that one sees there

1. William Henry Chamberlain, Soviet Russia, p. 395.

only what the government wishes. Reliable writers on Russia have testified to the falsity of this view. One of them said:

> "I went where I pleased and when I pleased, and at my numerous talks with foreign experts, no Russian was present."[1]

Under a dictatorship, it is somewhat difficult to gauge public sentiment because people feel a certain reticense about expressing their opinions. In Russia, the old propertied and educated class especially avoid foreigners, but, when one is able to gain contact with such a person, he gets a very definite idea of his views and feelings. Working-class and peasant Russia,- and they constitute 90 per cent of the population, - are open to the correspondent to explore as he wishes. Only Soviet Central Asia is closed to the foreigners, and it was a restricted zone for foreign travelers before the War. It is a general rule that the farther one goes from Moscow the less one sees and hears of the Gay-Pay-Oo United States Political Administration. If one comes to Russia with a hostile bias, he can find plenty to confirm his view; if he comes in a questioning mood and inquires injudiciously, he leaves Russia not with his opinion but with the opinion that the Soviet government has of itself; but, if he comes with a friendly attitude and an open mind, he may observe freely and form his own opinions.

The First Marriage Code, 1917-1918.

The first decrees on marriage were issued in December 1917 and codified in July 1918. These laws were formulated

1. Bruce Bliven, "Russia in Hope", New Republic, December 2, 1931.

in line with four principles of Bolshevism. The first of these is that sex relations must be without compulsion, either of physical violence or of economic pressure or by bonds of custom."[1] The second principle is that all men and women must have absolutely equal opportunity and equal responsibility in society and before the law. In the third place, the Bolshevik standard in regard to any law is not to revise the old laws but to create new ones. Even lawyers consider the old law not binding. Last of all, the Bolshevik government seeks to substitute loyalty to the State for loyalty to the family and thus gradually to disintegrate the family. Two decrees were passed, which entirely abolished the then existing marriage and divorce restrictions and introduced civil marriage. Religious ceremony was not abolished, but it was stripped of legal significance. Regardless of whether there had been a civil ceremony or not, a marriage was considered valid if a couple had a child or if the woman was pregnant.

Originally it was required that a common marriage name be adopted, which might be that of either bride or groom or a combination; but, in deference to the Lucy Stoners of both sexes, a later decree provided that they might either choose a common name or keep their pre-marriage names. A woman need not follow her husband if he changed his residence, and the citizenship of neither was affected by marriage.

A marriage could be annulled if the girl was below sixteen or the boy below eighteen [except where there was a child], if either side was in an "irresponsible" condition at the time of the marriage, or if consent had been given under

1. Anna Louise Strong, Marriage and Morals in Soviet Russia, p.4

pressure. Marriage was forbidden to the feeble-minded or mentally unfit, to parents and children, or to brothers and sisters. Polygamy was prohibited, and it was made a criminal offense to conceal one marriage at the time of another.

Divorce was made completely free. If husband and wife mutually desired a divorce, they signified their desire to the registrar, and a divorce was granted by the stroke of the pen. If only one party desired the divorce, he applied to the county court. The other party was notified. The court heard the case, made a decision, and rendered the decree. The court could not investigate the validity of the grounds for divorce. The court procedure was gone through in order to avoid discord concerning guardianship of children, common property, and alimony. Regardless of whether one or two sought the divorce, court proceedings were required if children were involved.

The term "illegitimate" as applied to children was abolished, and the support and care of every child, whether born in wedlock or out, was provided for.

> "The unmarried mother could inform the registration office three months before the birth of the baby of the name and residence of the father. If the latter offered no objection or proof to the contrary within two weeks, he was assumed to have accepted parenthood, and was held liable for the child's support. This also applied to the married woman whose husband was not the father of the child."[1]

If the men objected to being named the father of a child, the courts determined whether the course of his relations to the woman had been such as to make him the father of the child. If the court so decided, the man was named as father and the amount he was to contribute to the child's support was

1. Jessica Smith, Woman in Soviet Russia, p.96.

stipulated. Abortion was legalized and provision for it made in the hospitals.

This payment which, at stated intervals, the father gave the woman for the support of the child was called the "aliments." In deciding upon the amount, the court considered the man's financial standing and whether or not there were others dependent on him for support.

Children were permitted at the age of fourteen to decide on their own name, citizenship, and religion. Before that age, parents or the courts were to make the decision. Parents were required to support their children in their homes and prepare them for a useful activity. Children could be sent away for training or teaching but could not be hired out without their own consent. In line with its objective ultimately to care for all children publicly, the adoption of children was forbidden.

The conventional will gave way to legal inheritance, whereby any relatives dependent on the deceased for support received equal proportions of property. When the amount was insufficient to support all those having legal claims, the most needy were taken care of first. Wills were permitted only when equal distribution would be obviously unfair, but then only in favor of legal heirs. With one exception, only the wife living in actual marital relations at the time of her husband's death might receive a share of her husband's inheritance. The one exception was the divoreed wife still dependent on her former husband for support. One person could not inherit more than 10,000 rubles; the remainder went to the State.

In this first code, no community of property was created by marriage.

> "Any agreement between husband and wife regarding property was legally recognized providing it did not infringe on the rights of either. Husband and wife were made mutually responsible for each other's support, providing one was in need, and the other in a position to give the support. This applied after divorce until a change of circumstances; that is, a new marriage or a new job."[1]

The Effects of the First Marriage Code.

The effect of the new laws, combined with the "let-down" that in all countries accompanied and followed foreign war and, in Russia, the even more destructive civil war, was like the tearing down of the walls around a prison. Although the Russians had taken sex always as a matter of fact, yet they never had been used to anything but the most oppressive authority from both government and church. Now, for all practical purposes, both authorities were suspended. Naturally a period of free love of the wildest sort followed. Furthermore, the laws of 1917-1918 had been drawn up when the Bolsheviks, without any precedent for a guide, were whipping into shape a government for a region so vast that it covers one-fifth of the earth's surface. The results of this first code, then, are not to wondered at.

In the years following 1917, thousands of young men and women decided to do without the benefit of registration. There was a general feeling that registration savored of the Old Regime. Lawlessness and abandom to one's desires were the order of the day. Sometimes the forms this lawlessness took were extremely crude. If a young man visited a young woman in her room, he put his feet on the bed. A favorite

1. Ibid, p.95.

way by which a girl expressed her equality with men was the wearing of a man's cap.

Students in the cities squandered health and vitality in loose connections. Girl students replied to the criticism that they were resorting too frequently to abortions by saying that love was almost the only cheap amusement left to them. They demanded the same opportunity for free abortions that factory women had.

When the original law was promulgated, property and money had little significance. With the revival of trade and the reintroduction of money, it often happened that woman's work in the home which enabled the husband to carry on his work outside was completely un requited. In the case of a divorce, the husband technically could claim all the money or property accumulated through the joint efforts of both. Moreover, in the case of the peasants, division of property was impractical because a farm might be so completely dismantled as to be valueless.

Last of all, the section forbidding the adoption of children was unworkable. The State was not able to provide for the 300,000 shelterless children, some of whom had resulted from free love unions but most of whom were the aftermath of civil war, when the destruction of family life was large. These "wolf-children" traveled in gangs; they were lawless, and many of them were dope fiends and sex perverts. As a matter of fact, in spite of the law, some of them had been adopted.

The Revision of the Law.

In October 1925 certain changes were suggested in the

law. The first of these was that unregistered marriages be legalized. Property accumulated during marriage was to be owned jointly by husband and wife. In the peasant household, where the individual was too poor to pay alimony for his children's support, whether the marriage was registered or not, the household as a whole was to pay it. By November 1926, the draft for the new bill was ready.

Before the Codex was finally adopted, in a revised form, there was an extended period of debate, first in the throne room of the Tsars in Moscow, where the first meeting to consider the bill was held, and later in assemblies held out in the provinces. The debate hinged around this question: would giving the unregistered wife all legal rights prevent men from making many rash and temporary connections, or lead to polygamy and polyandry.

The opposition to the proposed Code seemed to center around the convictions: that it would abolish marriage; that it would destroy the family; that it would legalize polygamy and polyandry; that it would ruin the peasants.

The cities objected to the law on eugenic grounds. They contended that the recognition of de-facto marriages would lessen the number of registered marriages and weaken the control of the State over legal provisions regarding age and health. Some said that church marriages would be revived because couples married in church would satisfy all proofs of marriage required by the court and therefore could claim legal protection.

In the rural districts, there was a storm of protest over the proposed revision. From an economic standpoint, it was argued that the recognition of de-facto marriages would break up too many peasant farms. Peasant women were sure that

immorality would be increased. Some of the arguments were amusing. One woman cried:

> "A man can marry 365 times a year and produce that many children. Does the court recognize all of them?"[1]

Still another said:

> "We don't think it proper that a married man should pay for supporting children born after he is married to another woman. Ivan wouldn't do anything to Mary if Mary didn't want it, and Mary should know that he is married and that she has no rights.[2]

In general the feeling among the peasant women was that marriage would become a toy to be played with today and broken tomorrow.

But there were also many arguments presented in favor of the bill. Leon Trotsky and Madame Smidovich defended the law on the grounds that it gave greater economic protection to women. To them, the debate over the legalizing of de-facto marriages was wasted energy because, legal or not, they would be maintained. One of the staunch defenders of the revised bill was Madame Kollontai, Russia's foremost feminist and first woman ambassador to Norway.

Krilenko, the Soviet public persecutor who had had a large part in the framing of the bill, said in substance: there is nothing necessary, important, or utilitarian about the registration of a marriage. Why require it? Moreover, the new law is a step toward the ultimate aim of the Soviet state, which is free love without any restrictions, including economic. For the present, it must be recognized that marriage involves certain economic responsibilities; therefore the law takes upon itself the defense of the weaker partner.

1. Anna Louise Strong, op.cit., p. 13.
2. Ibid, p. 15.

Incorrectly would be interpreted. Some of the proponents even

worship. One author called:

> "A man can marry 365 times a year and remain that same spiritual man. Does the church recognize all of them?"

Still another said:

> "We don't claim it never has a wedding and it will try for reconciling couples long after he is married to another woman. Jesus wouldn't do anything to help if they didn't ask it, and they usually have been so hurtled and that has led to divorce."[2]

In general the feeling among the seminary people and their members

would insure a lot to be judged with loving and tender concern.

All these and also many statements appeared in favor

of the bill. Some irritated and tense relations between the

in on the grounds that it gave dangerous encouragement to

women. In fact, the basis over the legalizing of de-facto

marriage was the claimed energy therein, legal or not, they would

be substituted. One of the strong defenders of the revised

bill was Teresa Ui Ondal. Quelle informant Feminist and first

woman ambassador to Norway.

Finally, the Irish public servicator who had had a

large part in the forming of the bill, said in substance:

there is another necessity, temporal, or utilitarian after

the negotiation of a marriage. The reason is: Therefore,

the new law is a step toward the ultimate use of the Irish

state, which is free from any without any restrictions, involving

economic. For the present, it must be recognized that pre-

vious laws certain economic responsibilities; therefore

the law taken from itself the defense of the weaker partner.

1. Some Irish Friend, op.cit., p. 13.
2. Ibid., p. 13.

Women on the whole advocated the protection of unregistered marriages, and women's organizations from all over the country sent in resolutions in its favor. Women wanted nothing changed that would bring back the old patriarchal family life.

Due to the widespread protests to the new Code, it was not passed, but the spirit of it has gone into all court practice, and the substance of it has gone into changes made from time to time in the law. The attitude taken toward registration of marriages was expressed well by a judge in Moscow:

> "Registration of marriage is a fact which has legal weight if there is a dispute between the two parties as to the relation; but since both parties agree as to the actual relation, registration as such has no legal force and does not constitute a marriage. It is the actual marriage relation which must be taken into account."1

It must be borne in mind that "the statutes in Soviet Russia are not construed as rigidly as ours and courts have the right to enlarge upon the law and to judge more freely as to the violation of its operation."2

The Marriage Law.

In Russia today, in order to register a marriage, both the man and the woman must be at least eighteen. The change from sixteen to eighteen in the case of the girl was made because early marriage had proved to be an obstacle to women being educated. Girls became mothers and workers so young that they aged prematurely. Both parties to a marriage must be free from other marital relations, registered or unregistered. They may marry without their parent's consent, and they must not be

1. Ibid, p. 12.
2. Edward Byron Reuter and Jessie Ridgway Runner, ed., The Family, p. 531. Adapted from Holzberg, Julius, "Divorce in Russia and America," Nation, CXXVIII June 19, 1927, pp. 734, 735.

of near kinship. They must have physical examination, particularly in regard to venereal diseases, tuberculosis and mental psychoses. Russian law makes a registered marriage between feeble-minded persons impossible.

Neither marriage nor divorce cost more than a few kopeks reguired for registration. "In the cities, there is always a long queue of strangely assorted couples waiting at the Registry Clerk's desk."[1] It takes just twenty minutes to examine the identification documents, question the bride and groom as to whether they are entering the marriage state voluntarily, and have them write their names in the book of marriage. Theoretically there is no limit to the number of times a person may be married. Sometimes the clerk will attempt to dissuade one from a seventh or eighth marriage, but if the arguments of the petitioners are valid, the marriage is permitted.

To compete more effectively with the long and pompous church wedding of the Old Regime, a special room has been set aside for the registration of marriages, and the head of the Department has been instructed to officiate rather than one of the clerks. Those who desire a service even more like the old church wedding are married use the service of a red wedding. Jessica Smith, in Woman in Soviet Russia, describes such a service, as it was held in a factory. The bride and groom sat on a red draped platform, attended by fellow union members and representatives of the women's organization. The head of the factory committee was master of ceremonies. The pair pledged themselves to work mutually to raise the production of the factory, and, after suitable speeches had been made, refreshments were served.

1. Jessica Smith, op. cit., p. 92.

[illegible]

Occasionally, in the backward villages where the older generation has been slow to take up the revolutionary ideas, one sees an old-fashioned church wedding or "white wedding." Maurice Hindus describes one in his own village.[1] The details are interesting but too unimportant to be included here; but the comment of a peasant woman is illuminating as an expression of the contract between the old generation and the new. During the ceremony and festivities the bride and groom have been so calm and unmoved emotionally as to thoroughly provoke the old woman, who says:

> "And, really, why should a bride nowadays weep? This Anna. Come here in a few days and see who will be the head of the house. And they are all getting to be like that nowadays, these young women. Even their father cannot tell them things any more."

The unregistered or de-facto marriage in Russia corresponds to the common-law marriage in England and America. Less proof is required to establish the marital state in Russia.

> "Cohabitation, a common household, and a holding out to the world of a marital status are deemed the essentials of a common-law marriage. In Soviet Russia the fact of 'holding out to the world' of the marital status is the most important, and it would be extremely difficult for a man who held out a woman as his wife later to repudiate her as such."[2]

A de-facto marriage can be proved valid in court even when the husband is dead or when he denies its binding force. It is a bar to a second marriage. The wife to a de-facto marriage has the right of inheritance and shares in the common property acquired during their married life together.

Every church marriage must be preceded by a registered marriage, and a certificate from a registered marriage must be

1. Maurice Hindus, "A White Wedding," Asia, XXXI (May 1931),pp.
2. Edward Byron Reuter and Jessie Ridgway Runner, op.cit.,p.530.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

presented to the priest or rabbi before he may perform a marriage ceremony.

A husband and wife have certain mutual responsibilities. The responsibility for housekeeping is shared. A husband or wife may claim support from the other partner for one year if incapacitated and for six months if unemployed.

Divorce

When there are no children involved, securing a divorce in Russia is simplicity itself.

> "Either party may obtain a divorce without stating any cause and without notifying the opposite party, simply by applying at the divorce bureau. The applicant gives his or her name, address, and various other descriptive information; his identification papers are then stamped and the deed is done."[1]

The actual procedure takes five minutes, but the waiting in line for one's turn consumes another half hour. There are no court proceedings or lawyers' fees. No attempt is made at reconciliation; such efforts would bring rebuke upon the judge. After the divorce is granted, the other party, if not present, is notified of the divorce within three days.

If the divorce was not entered in the registry books, even the above procedure is dispensed with, and the man and woman part without formalities.

If the applicant for a divorce has children, then the story is quite different. The Russian law can be rigorous as well as lenient. Where children are involved, the law steps in, not to hold the family together, for that would be an outrage against individual liberty, but to protect the children.

1. Ibid, p. 529.

The case must go through the court. The hearing may be held immediately, if the docket is not filled, or it may not come up for two weeks; but that is the limit of the delay. The court determines who shall have the children, how much alimony shall be paid, and by whom. Although the court may grant to either parent the custody of the child, it usually gives the child to the mother because she is better fitted to care for it.

As yet, it is the practice to assess alimony from the man. Women pay alimony as seldom in Russia as in the United States. The reason is not hard to find. Alimony is assessed from the one most able to pay. Thus far, men have had better educational opportunities than women and have commanded the best salaries. As women achieve an economic status more equal to that of men, it is a question whether they may not be assessed for alimony as frequently as are men.

Alimony is calculated on the basis of a certain percentage of a man's salary, which amount is deducted from his pay at the factory. The amount depends upon the man's salary and his obligations to other dependents. The usual practice is to assess from 25 to 35 percent of the man's earnings. In no case may more than 50 percent be taken. Alimony may be arranged outside the court, but the arrangement must be satisfactory to the authorities. Alimony is paid until the child is eighteen.

There are two circumstances under which alimony may be granted to a wife personally for her support: "first when her earning capacity is lost through physical inability to work, which inability originated during the marriage; and second, when she is out of employment."[1] In the first case, alimony is paid

1. Ibid, p. 531.

for a period not exceeding one year and, in the latter case, for not more than six months. If it is the husband who is incapacitated and the wife who is working, the tables are turned.

When a man and woman marry, each retains the property he had before marriage, and, in the case of a divorce, the earnings that have accrued during married life are divided as the court decrees. A woman's labors in the home are given a monetary value. It is exceedingly difficult to divide the earnings from a farm; the problem is complicated further by the presence on the farm of the parents, brothers and sisters of one of the parties to the divorce. The usual way out of the difficulty in either a childless divorce or an alimony case is to make a money settlement or to set aside a part of the crop.

The Treatment of Prostitutes.

The treatment of prostitutes is under the direction of the "Central council to Combat Prostitution," which in turn is under the Department of Health. Prostitutes are treated in the prophylactorium; here they are given medical treatment and taught a trade, usually textile-machine operating. When they have learned a trade, they are given positions. The officials of the prophylactorium keeps in contact with them as long as is necessary. Some revert to their former occupation, but the records indicate that the precentage is less than ten.

All decrees relating to the prostitute say that Russia is fighting the institution, not the individual. The law punishes those who profit from exploiting women rather than the prostitute herself. The prostitute is punished only if she spreads venereal disease, which is likewise a punishable offense for men.

Venereal dispensaries, of which there are an extensive chain throughout Russia, are made a special medium for combating prostitution. In connection with them there are organized courses, lectures, and moving pictures, not only for those under treatment, but also for the general population. The Department of Health seeks not only to cure the prostitute but, by working out hygienic rules of living, and by developing a sense of shame among the workers and youth that prostitution should exist in a proletarian state, to eliminate the institution.

Russia argues that prostitution results from economic pressure and from inadequate housing. "The real test of Communist philosophy in this general matter will come when the housing shortage is relieved."[1]

1. Bruce Bliven, "Religion and Love in Russia", The New Republic, LXXIX (December 23, 1931).

Children Born out of Wedlock.

The laws regarding the declaring of parenthood and the support of children born out of wedlock have remained practically the same as they were in the beginning. It will not be necessary, therefore, to go into them in detail again. The court determines what percentage of the father's salary must go to the support of the child, - usually one-third, - and what part of the expenses connected with pregnancy and birth he must pay. It is a familiar saying in Russia that "he who likes coasting must carry his sled up hill."

There is a provision in the law to the effect that, if a woman names several men as possible fathers, the court shall designate one as the father. The purpose of the law is to save the child from embarrassment. As one wit put it:

> "The possession of a stock company in place of a father might prove too embarrassing to the child, whose playmates might call out, 'There goes the son of Ivanov and Company.'"[1]

Alimony probably makes free love unions less frequent than they otherwise would be. Even so, they are frequent enough to, in some measure, cut down commercialized prostitions. There is nothing disgraceful or secretive about the paying of alimony, which might make a man dodge the paying of it if he could. Anna Louise Strong tells that a friend of hers works in a government shop selling metals with ten men who are paying alimony.

> "No one thinks to ask, either legally or socially, if a marriage ceremony was performed; the presence of a child is the only fact that counts in this case, and all are alike "paying alimony" for which the women come frankly to the cashier of the store, collecting it directly as a lien on the man's wages."[2]

1. Jessida Smith, op.cit., p.
2. Anna Louise Strong, op.cit., p. 17.

In the country, however, the attitude toward such matters is less liberal. There are fewer cases of alimony because peasant girls have greater fear of disgrace and are less apt to demand it.

Birth Control and Abortions.

Russian law requires that, before a woman has been pregnant more than two and one-half months, she must be examined to determine if she is fit to give birth to a healthy child. If she is not, she must have an abortion performed. Since 1920, the hospitals have been legalized to perform abortions. There are two other very good reasons for this law. One is that a woman must not be made to bear any more of the responsibility that goes with free love than does the man. The other is that birth control is not sure.

The Institute for Protection of Motherhood and Childhood is sponsoring research which "they hope will result in perfect contraceptives, and all application of their results is being done by the doctors in the clinics."[1] In the application of their methods, doctors are not hampered either by medical tradition or by sex consciousness. ---- physicians, nurses, will go into minute explanations in language audaciously frank, of the function, physiology, hygiene, technique of sex, and again the audience invariably is mixed."[2]

No birth control information is given at the time a marriage is registered, for which fact the doctors criticize the Government. The financial situation, is such that the

1. Alice Withrow Field, Protection of Women and Children in Soviet Russia, p. 87.
2. Maurice Hindus, ~~op. cit. p.~~ Humanity Uprooted, p. 105.

Government can support only the Institute for Motherhood and Childhood, and that organization must take care of all the problems relating to women's rights.

In Moscow and a number of other cities and towns, as well as on cooperative farms, there are health clinics for women and children which are known as Points of Consultation.

> "Any woman who is socially insured or whose husband carries social insurance, is entitled to free care and advise from the Point of Consultation in her residential district. All others may obtain treatment and advise for nominal fees, if they can pay. Whether they can or not is decided by the visiting nurse."[1]

The pregnant woman goes first to her local Point of Consultation. There a record is made of her case and an appointment with the Doctor, she is visited by a nurse who presents her report to the doctor.

The doctor, after talking with the woman,makes a decision regarding the advisability of an abortion. This decision is dependent upon the woman's financial condition, her health, the size of her family already, and the number of abortions she has had. If there is very good reason for having the abortion performed, the doctor gives the woman an order to the State Hospital. If there is no good reason for the child's not being born, the doctor will do all in his power to persuade the woman not to have the operation performed. In about half the cases, it is possible to persuade the women to change their minds. If a woman insists, however, and gives every reason except the real one, which is that it is her right, she is given a ticket to the State Hospital. In the State Hospital, women are given another even more thorough examination.

1. Alice Withrow Field, op.cit., p.88.

Here it is possible usually to persuade from one-fourth to one-half more not to have the operation performed.

The Russian doctor is at liberty to use practically any argument he wishes to convince a woman not to have an abortion. He explains to her that she is hurting herself. In extreme cases, he asks a patient to visit the operating room and see an operation performed. The latter argument is usually very convincing. Russia does not consider abortion an unmixed blessing. The doctors realize that it is more dangerous than the prevention of conception. Some of them consider it a social evil which must be destroyed in the near future. In the museums for women and children, there are posters and elaborate charts showing the consequences of abortions when performed in the hospital and when performed privately.

The Russian hospitals have had unusual success with operations of this nature. According to the Moscow Bureau of Statistics:

> "In State hospitals, o.79% of abortions result in death. In U. S. S. R. in 1923, 42% of abortions resulted in death, which means that more than 41% of abortions were not performed in a State hospital. In 1927, the amount had been decreased to about 14%. That is why doctors feel that legalized abortions has been a good thing - and that it is the best possible means of combating the evil."[1]

Birth control is given at the Points of Consultation. The patient is interviewed by the nurse and doctor and visited in her home much the same as when she desires an abortion. The Russian State appreciates the value of eugenics. It considers legalized birth control as the best weapon with which to fight abortion.

1. Ibid, p. 78.

Mothers and Children.

> "The show place of the Soviet health organization is the work for mothers and children that is being carried on in Moscow, where the Soviet Union Health Department maintains a demonstration center in connection with its division of Motherhood and Infancy. ---- This is an experimental and demonstration center to which specialists come from all parts of the Soviet Union."1

The aims of this health center are to care for a certain number of mothers and children in conformity with the health laws and to provide an educational center in which health work can be taught and demonstrated.

The activities of the health center are organized around three periods in an infant's life: the pre-natal period, the period of childbirth, and the post-natal period. There is a consultation center for expectant mothers and also a delivery hospital. A model milk kitchen is maintained. There is an out-patient department for sick babies, and a baby hospital where expert medical attention is given. Eight or ten wet nurses live in the hospital, In the Summer, open-air camps are maintained for sick babies. The health center also maintains a training school for nurses who are preparing to do children's work and for mid-wives.

The Soviet Government aims to have these health centers distributed throughout the Union, but finances do not permit such an ambitious program at present. Health boards in the villages are poor but clean and facilities are stretched to the utmost. Everything is free, organized and unified. To an unsympathetic observer, the work that is done may seem inadequate and inefficient; but it must not be described in

1. Scott Nearing, Glimpses of the Soviet Republic, p. 22.

terms of what actually has been accomplished but in terms of what the people are trying to do.

Under the Soviet regime, Russia has experienced one very beneficial social reform; that is the large-scale provision of free nurseries for the children of working women and the enactment of a number of laws for the benefit of the working woman who becomes a mother. One of these laws forbids the discharge of a pregnant mother, except in case the entire factory is shut down.

In every large factory where women are employed in any considerable number, there are now day nurseries where mothers may leave their children during working hours, instead of being obliged, as in former times, to leave them in the care of some questionable person. In the summer, there are nurseries in the country for the women who work in the fields. Of course, like every other social reform, these nurseries are at present inadequate; moreover, the cost of operating them is abnormally high. The maintenance of a child in a nursery costs the state about thirty rubles a month, which is equal to the monthly wage of many unskilled workers. However, the nurseries have been of very definite social benefit, especially in connection with the laws which guarantee eight weeks vacation before and an equal amount of time after the childbirth for factory workers and six weeks for office workers.

The working mother is permitted to feed her child for half an hour every three or four hours, on pay, and she receives a payment from the state social insurance funds for feeding and clothing the child in the first months of its

existence.

The nursery is controlled through its own committee. There is no sense of charity connected with it.

> "The social insurance funds takes from every industry amounts equaling from one-sixth to one-seventh of the total pay-roll, and use it lavishly for the care of invalid workers and for the birth expenses of factory babies, whether these are born to working women or the wives of workers."[1]

The Care of Motherless Children.

One problem that the Soviet Union has to face is the care of motherless infants and children. These children are one of the unhappy results of the family disintegration that comes with civil war and free love, The Soviet Union has been accused of taking children away from parents in order that the State might control them completely. While this practice has been advocated by many Communists and no doubt is an ideal to be sought by the extremists in the party, thus far it has been followed only in conditions of famine, when mothers dumped their children on the State to save them from starvation and in the viccisitudes of civil war.

Motherless infants are given out for private care. Theoretically, this practice is utterly contrary to the teaching of Bolshevism, but the Soviet Union has a reason for it. That reason is the one that governs every treatment of the child, namely, the health of the baby. It was found that nursing babies could not survive in the hospitals, even with the best care. The mortality ran from 40 to 100 percent. In fairness to the Russians, it must be said that this percentage was no worse than elsewhere. The Soviet Union followed the advice given by experts everywhere - to give the babies

1. Anna Louise Strong, op.cit., p.34.

out under state direction to individual mothers.

When the Moscow Health Department advertised through the Baby Consultations that mothers were wanted to look after babies for pay, 1250 applied, from which 450 were chosen. Every woman was thoroughly examined physically, even to the giving of a blood test, and was judged from the social standpoint. The babies also were given blood tests. The mother received a bed, bath tub, linen and clothing for the baby. She was paid $12.50 a month for her work; in Moscow that is a reasonable remuneration. The Consultation provided her with free milk and gruel and fruit juices. Mothers were instructed to bring their children each week to the Consultation for examination, and once each week the doctor or nurse inspects the home.

Most of the babies when given out were underweight; some of them weighed little more than half their normal weight. Practically all of them gained under the new care, as babies always will.

> "The new thing in the Soviet Union is not the style of treatment, which can be duplicated by good organization for child care in many cities, but the fact that, a revolution having once upset traditions, new methods can be adapted easily, and when once proved useful, can be spread with a rapidity unhampered by any customs or traditions or vested interests, even vested charitable interests."[1]

In addition to the motherless infants, Russia has had the problem of caring for the adolescent and pre-adolescent children of whom mention has been made. It will be remembered that, in the early part of the new regime, adoption was forbidden. The Government proposed to care for all of the

1. Anna Louise Strong, op.cit., p.44.

homeless children. However, with thousands cast into her lap, she had more than she could do. "As many as possible were returned to any relative who could be found capable of caring for them."1 Those who have become criminals live in the prison communes. In the Workers' Commune at Bolshevo for prisoners, more than half the inmates do not know the whereabouts of their parents. Those children the problem of whose care has not been solved by the prisons are housed in other communes. These communes, both the prison camps and the others, are self-governing trade schools located away from the cities.

Housing in Soviet Russia.

> "It is significant that in the new homes which are being built in Russia, the apartments are small - between two and three rooms, rarely four and never more. Large apartments will never be built while the present regime is in power. The home can never again be a physical or any other kind of a castle."2

The Russians say that so much of family life is being transferred to the outside that there is no longer need for large apartments. In the new homes that are being planned, the nursery may be in a separate part of the building or in a house of its own in the yard. The mother and father will be encouraged to maintain ample contacts with the child; they may take it home occasionally and assist in its physical and spiritual development.

1. Karl Borders, "Social Work in the Soviet Union, "Social Service Review, June 1931, pp. 237-245.

2. Maurice Hindus, op.cit., p.113.

V

The Outcome for Russia.

Sex in Soviet Russia.

He would be rash indeed who would presume to predict what will be the future of the family in Soviet Russia. History repeats itself insofar as past events determine future events. Present day Russia has discarded traditions with vehemence. Russia is creating a tradition that is State centered.

> "Communists start with no external moral truths but with the authority of a social control which must rationally work out its norm of conduct, leaving the utmost freedom to the individual consistent with social welfare."[1]

Theoretically the family cannot continue because it is an individual unit. The question is: will it endure for other reasons?

One must remind himself of the Russian attitute toward sex. This attitude is difficult for a Westerner to understand. Russia has always been free from the inhibitions, restraints, and artificial repressions of other countries. "Sex is considered a wholewome thing but not an all-absorbing object in life."[2] The Russians are vital, simple, and unrepressed. There is an absence of that insidious sex suggestiveness in their literature and amusements which is so much a part of ours. Because of this frank sex attitude, Russian men and women have worked side by side to bring in the new regime, and there has been a more natural and equal relation between them than anywhere else in the world.

1. Sherwood Eddy, The Challenge of Russia, p. 126.
2. Ibid, p. 131.

To be sure, in the early days of the revolution, when the marriage laws were first relaxed, a wave of promiscuity swept over the country, particularly among the youth. War always brings with it that attitude that, when death is imminent, men may take what pleasures they desire. In Russia the pressure of the Revolution and the awful famine was worse than the war had been. Several novels which were published in 1926 and 1927, such as Pantalei-Romanov's Without Sentimentality, and Lev Gumilovsky's Dogs' Street, give a vivid picture of frequent and rapid changes of partners by students of both sexes, which characterized this period.

For two principal reasons, there was a reaction to this excessive interest in matters of sex. One of these was the element of satiety. The other was the arguments of communist moralists. The communist leaders said that excessive loose living was wrong, not from the moral or ethical point of view, but from the view point that it unfits a Communist for the strenuous work which he must perform. A comrade who spends too much time in love affairs cannot fulfil his duties to the Party and the proletariat. Excessive preoccupation with sex is a sign of bourgeois decadence. So say the leaders. No doubt, this attitude may be explained in part as a manifestation of that conservatism which becomes characteristic of a party in power. On the other hand, there is ample argument for moderation in Lenin's writings.

Lenin says:

> "Certainly thirst must be satisfied, but does a normal person, under normal conditions, lie in the street and drink from mud puddles? Or even from a glass that dozens of other people have

> been drinking from? But still more important is the social aspect of it. Drinking water is an individual matter. But two participate in love and from it arises a third new life. Here the interests of society come in. ---- The revolution demands concentration; the straining of all energies by the masses and the individual. The proletarian is an advancing class. He doesn't need drunkeness to deaden or arouse him, either through sexual intemperance or alcohol. He needs clarity."1

Inasmuch as Lenin is venerated with a feeling that is almost, if not absolute, worship, his teachings may be expected to have some influence.

It is interesting to observe that Communist Leaders are realizing that it is the girl who suffers most from promiscuous love relations. One of them said:

> "Don't we see that a girl who has been dissolutioned in a young lover is a broken human being, at least for a year or two? Mustn't there be responsibility in relations between man and woman?"2

Despite these occasional monitions from Communists of the older generation, "free love" is still "probably the rule rather than the exception among the city youth."3 The peasant is conservative. While it is no doubt true that the large percentage of Communist youth is adopting the creed of moderation, one may still find everything from libertinism to asceticism; and despite the fact that Communism recognizes only one kind of love, namely love for one's fellow proletarian and has publicly disgraced Cupid, the god of romantic love, romance is creeping back.

1. Woman in Social Russia, p. 135. (From Sherwood Eddy, op. cit., p. 126.
2. William Henry Chamberlain, op. cit., p. 328.
3. Ibid, p.

However, sex equality is still somewhat theoretical. Crimes and suicides as a result of disappointed love and jealousy are far from uncommon in Russia today. The moral conveyed by motion pictures and current literature is that the husband should forgive and forget when his wife has a child by some other man; but such indifference is the exception rather than the rule, especially among the masses of the people.

It has been said already, it is possible that the Russian woman, with her recently acquired liberties, may become as promiscuous in her love life as man is reputed to be; but

> "the Russians feel sure that, through their education and their social action and interaction between the group and the individual, woman will acquire too stirring a sense of social responsibility to abandon herself to a reckless search for sex pleasures."[1]

Someone has said that the Russian women are beginning to take marriage and love with solemn earnestness. One wonders if that has not always been so. Sherwood Eddy, in his recent book, The Challenge of Russia,[2] tells how, when he was conducting a recent trip in Russia, a member of the party asked a beautiful young guide if she would marry him. She rebuffed him and, when he said to her, "Why,don't you ever joke about anything?" she replied, "Not about serious things."

If a study of the history of the family shows anything, it would seem to be that the maternal urge is stronger in woman than the corresponding urge in man. Marriage is for a woman life at its fullest, all feminists to the contrary.

1. Maurice Hindus, op. cit., p. 99.
2. p. 129.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Although the wiping out of old traditions has made it easier for her to go from one love affair to another, such conduct takes too large a toll to be profitable. If the Russian woman will combine with her civic-mindedness an attitude toward marriage that is based on sense and not sentimentality, who shall say that she may not be a model for women everywhere to follow.

Result of Marriage and Divorce Laws.

It cannot be said that the Russians whole-heartedly approve of their marriage laws; the extensive discussion at the time of the revision of the Code is proof of that. Someone has gone so far as to say that

> "the present marriage code is a makeshift. Given an apportunity, any intelligent young Russian will talk for hours on the subject (of marriage), asking innumerable questions about the attitude of the rest of the world."[1]

Although Soviet law abounds in restrictions and regulations, it leaves the matter of marriage entirely open to the free will of the parties concerned. The loyal revolutionist, with his firm belief in the priority of loyalty to State, does not desire to place upon marriage any restrictions that will tend to make it permanent.

> "The love of a woman for one man and of a man for one woman is too likely to bring with it the longing for home, for property, for settling down, for all the philistine coziness of the bourgeoisie', as one revolutionist has put it."[2]

The rate of divorce has greatly increased during recent years, particularly in the large industrial towns, but this growth may be due to the rapid change in social conditions

1. Dorothy Thompson,(Mrs. Sinclair Lewis), op. cit., p. 101.
2. Ibid, p. 100.

rather than to the new legal procedures. In some cities, especially Moscow, which has experienced a phenomenal growth, divorce has reached immense proportions, during certain months equalling, and, in March 1928, once actually exceeding the number of marriages. In 1927, when the new Code, which greatly changed the divorce procedure, went into effect, the number of divorces experienced an increase.

The divorce rate in the whole of European Russia in 1926 was 126 to every 1000 marriages. In the United States for the same year the rate was 152. For the other European countries,the rate was lower. When one compares Russia with the United States, he cannot be surprized that, to moralize with the Russians, is to receive the reply that the American young people are causing their elders some concern too. The Russians think, moreover, that this high divorce rate is only a temporary condition, and that the divorce rate will decline.

The greatest number of divorces are granted to men and women between the ages of 25 and 34. Out of every 1000 divorces granted in Leningrad in 1926, 840 were granted to one party and 160 by mutual consent. For Moscow, the figures were 864 and 135.1 It would seem that with such an overwhelming majority of divorces being granted at the request of one party, there must be many who are bereaved.

Divorce is more common in the city than in the country. As has been said already, the peasant takes up with the new ideas more slowly than the city person. In the village the family as a patriarchal unit is very firmly established.

1. Figures from Lubinsky, Paul, "Marriage and Divorce in Soviet Russia," The Family, X (March 3, 1929), p. 30.

The peasant women still usually demands a church wedding and feels the personal and social stigma of a child born out of wedlock more keenly than her city sister. Moreover, it is both inconvenient and impractical to divide the land, stock and property. Even a crop settlement brings impoverishment to both parties.

The results of Russia's marriage and divorce laws are so closely bound up with free love and the new position of women that the effects of one may be considered also the effects of the other. However, there are one or two results that have not been mentioned.

Soviet marriage laws have lessened prostitution. One reason is apparent: casual marriages can be entered into lightly. Although, as has been shown, this favorable effect has its definite counterbalancing effect, yet a lessening of prostitution is a course for rejoicing. There is at least one other contributing cause for its lessening which is immensely to the credit of the Soviet Republic. The Soviet Government realizes that one of the most effective means of fighting prostitution is by raising the economic level of the workers and spreading socialization. When these things have been accomplished, it believes that prostitution will disappear.

The Russian marriage laws have had one obvious bad effect. They have created a new class of beznadzorni (literally "children without care"), who have replaced the shelterless waifs or wolf children of the days immediately following the Civil War. These children are growing up as child delinquents and give no little concern to the Soviet social

organizations. The conservative contends that these children are the result of the letting-down of parental authority and the absorption of women into industry and other outside activities. The radical's reply is: eliminate the problem; make fuller provision for nurseries, kindergartens, and supervised children's playgrounds.

Summary.

Russia is a land which is going through a revolutionary epoch in which "everything seems possible, from the change of the calendar to the 'liquidation' of God."[1] It is a land in which nothing seems impossible. Indeed, to the Bolshevik, nothing is impossible. "If anything appears difficult, it is only because it has not been approached in the 'Bolshevik spirit'"[2] The Russian has boundless faith in the power of energy.

This Russian revolution has, out of terrible turmoil, given birth to epoch-making social reforms. It has eliminated the illegitimate child. It has taken from divorce the mockery that comes from living together after all reason for doing so is gone. By its abolition of wealth, it has made it possible for young people to marry at an early age, "when the sex impulses are at an expecially acute tension."[3] It has given woman a chance to realize her desire for a career. It has given the world a sane and sensible attitude toward sex.

But the study of Russia has raised certain questions which make one loath to say confidently that, as far as love

1.Michael Farbman, Piatiletka: Russia's Five Year Plan, p.208.
2.Ibid.
3.Maurice Hindus, op. cit., p. 129.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

and the family are concerned, Russia is going to realize her aims.

One wonders if the psychological disruption and social ruin that come with what amounts to the existence of free love is not too dear a price to pay for the privilege. One wonders too how far Russia will really go in the realization of her aims. Will that remarkable self-sacrificing patrictism for the proletariat, that makes the Russian yough willing to endure poor food and poorer clothes for the sake of the proletariat State, endure until Russia has given full realization to her schemes for public care of children and elimination of the family? There can be no doubt that that time will be delayed, for Russia's attention is turned now to the apparently more pressing needs for iron and coal and new industries. Will the Russian people, as they see about them the disadvantages of their unperfected marriage system, such as the homeless children, be patient to wait until these evils are eliminated?

One wonders if Russia's scheme for doing away with the family has not come too late in evolution. The race has lived too long with certain rewards of family life to part with them. The finest love of which man knows anything is realizable only in the privacy of the family. The race "has come into the real, if partial, sway of the monogamous impulse."[1] Is it not rather late to attempt its destruction?

1. Harry Emerson Fosdick, op. cit. (Quotation from Dr. Hadfield of London).

VI

The Family of the Future

Resources of the Family.

The family is in transition, trying to adapt itself to social circumstances. The mischief-maker that is making all the changes necessary is something that cannot be coerced: science. Science has had a century, and everything is changed; no one dares to prophesy how it will affect the future. Science has taken from the home its economic reason for existence. City life, which takes in more people than does rural life, is unfriendly to the family. Then, society has substituted a pleasure philosophy for the pain philosophy that came out of poverty and a wrong interpretation of religion. It requires more character to live a pleasure philosophy, and a lack of stability at first must be expected, with emphasis on the physical pleasures. Persons must learn to discriminate between temporary and permanent pleasures, elevating and degrading ones; and that takes time. Meanwhile, to help itself through this ordeal, the family has four resources.[1]

It has the resource of sex. Marriage is a licencing of sex. It makes possible the largest and most pleasurable use of sex. Sex requires an intimacy that comes from permanency. Promiscuous sex relations give meager satisfaction.

The family has the resource of children. There is more satisfaction in parenthood than in anything else. To be sure they are an economic responsibility and liability; but the man who economizes by not having them drives himself into exile.

1. Included in a lecture by Professor Ernest Rutherford Groves at the Old South Forum, November 29, 1931.

When one has children, he achieves a type immortality.

The family brings companionship. Friendship is difficult and expensive; it requires the constant expenditure of effort to please. Many marriages would be happier if more of the friendship element entered in. Companionship is liberal, progressive, and elevating in marriage.

The fourth resource has been a long time coming. That is affection. Perhaps it has always been present but has been submerged in the numerous other functions the family has had in the past. "Society has reached a stage where people do not often marry for economic advantage, and we are coming rapidly to the point where many refuse to marry as a means of obtaining sex experience. The new motive upon which marriage must more universally depend for its attraction must be affection."[1] Affection is the best anchor the family has today. Affection is kinder, more considerate, and more lasting than romantic love and passion. Where can you have affection better than in the family? The family will be the last social relation to go because of this.

Affection has lifted the marriage relationship to a new level.

> "On the lowest matrimonial level, we find sex tied to property rights. The woman is merely an indispensable medium by which man obtains his sex satisfactions. ---- On a higher level we find society primarily trying to regulate sex because of its social dangers. Here a marriage attempts to stabilize the union of male and female, and to protect society from the menace of unrestrained and irresponsible sex behavior. ---- With the development of an efficient, although not absolutely safe contraception, the fundamental motive of the fear code was shaken ---- the right of sex expression was for both the man and the woman the cornerstone of

1. Ernest Rutherford Groves, The Marriage Crisis, p. 175.

> the new attitude. ---- The lifting of the marriage relationship to the conditions of affection does not remove constraint, but merely changes its form."[1]

It creates a new set of matrimonial values of a higher value than those produced by the property or the fear code, "and necessarily the testing of the personality of men and women is more severe than in the earlier stages of marital relationship."[2]

The family is the principal burden-bearer of all our social institutions. It is the only place where each person may express his dissatisfactions freely, can "be himself." The opportunity that the intimacy of the home provides makes it a clearing house for every sort of discontent, a dumping ground for all sorts of grievances. It does not originate as many difficulties as it is charged with; it gives them rather a chance to be aired. The family is a relief station, where the tired business man can recover from the shappness of business and social clashing. His father and grandfather led out-of-door lives and lived under lower pressure; they demanded less of the family in this regard. In the turmoil and unrest of the present, emotional security is demanded of the family as never before, and the blame that is heaped upon it is placed there without any consideration of the difficult problem which faces the family in meeting these demands.

Bringing About Happy Family Life.

If marriage in general is to be improved, there are many reforms that will be necessary. Common law marriage must be abolished. Child marriages must be prevented by

1. Ibid, pp. 173-174.
2. Ibid, p. 174.

[illegible] ---- [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

legislation. Eugenic marriage laws are needed. These reforms however do not relate directly to individualism and so they will not be considered here.

Advanced civilization, the need for specialization, and the desire for self-expression have caused a delay in the age of marriage.

> "Undue strain is put upon many youth because of their necessity of postponing marriage. This could easily be changed if public opinion would recognize the advantage of those marrying who are mature and thoroughly committed to their choice, but are still continuing professional education."[1]

Society must help to create an economic condition which will make it possible for young people to marry at an earlier age than is now permissible. Lateness of marriage is an economic cause for divorce. It is an evil that a high standard of living must bring in its train, so long as young men cannot earn enough to reach it early. There must be an adjustment, and it will come perhaps from the women. If girls compete with men in business, they must cooperate with them in founding a home. "Girls are earning money on their own account to help their young men; and they are also, in a few cases at least, learning temporarily to adjust themselves to standards their young men can afford."[2]

> ----"the patriarchal standard which requires the husband to be the sole wage-working supporter of a wife and family requires the postponement of marriage and the frustration of early adult love, and tends to turn the adolescent period of courtship from one of emotional education and responsible selection into one ofpurposeless sexual pleasure. But the adolescent courtship period can be made a responsible one and early marriage can be made generally possible, through an economic cooperation of husband and wife in preparation for children."[3]

1. Ibid, p. 192.
2. George A. Bartlett, op. cit; p. 212.
3. Floyd Dell, Love in the Machine Age, p. 364.

[illegible] individualism. Marriage analysts have been numerous. These sections however do not relate directly to individualism and so they will not be considered here.

Increased individualism. The need for rationalization, and the search for self-interpretation have caused a delay in the age of marriage.

> "Under which is you are only young people reaching of their maturity of individual development. This would usually be assumed if society's ideals were consistent and stable. Values of elders interpret the ideals and their society's ideals are basic unique. They are still developing their profile about society."

Society must also to provide an economic condition which will make it possible for young people to marry at an earlier age than is now possible. Increase of marriage is an economic cause for divorce. It is an evil that a time statement of dating must follow in life times. In fact, as young men become more mature to marry is early. Young men in an situation, and it will come reduce from the women. It also indicate with men in business. They must concentrate also time in producing a home. "Girls are studying longer or really one student to take their young men; and that are also, in a few cases at least, intellectual inferiority to adjust themselves in standards their young men in effort."[2]

> ----"The individual theorist which requires the individuals to be the sole supervising authorities of a life and family requires the management of marriage and the distribution of family life, and leads to the adjustment period of courtship from one of mutual and responsible activities into a pleasure-seeking sexual pleasure. But the adjustment period can be made a responsible one and social marriage can be more generally possible, through an economic understanding of marriage and life is preparation for children."[3]

1. Ibid., p. 128.
2. Harry A. Carstairs, op. cit., p. 212.
3. Floyd Hall, Love in the Modern Age, p. 164.

In the second place, there must be education for marriage and parenthood. The West has been more progressive than the East in providing such education, but courses are being put into medical schools, law schools, and theological seminaries everythere. Such education can be carried on easier in the higher institutions of learning; ---- "indeed, one wonders how it has come about that institutions whose primary purpose is to advance human culture have been so hesitant in training for the most important of human relationships."[1]

Perhaps education for marriage can help most by creating the proper attitude toward marriage. To do that is to contribute much, because the family is,more than the external manifestations of it, an attitude. Domestic science courses can help, but they cannot do all. Domestic science courses overemphasize the importance of the mechanical aspects of family life. There is more to successful family life than household technique and budgets. Floyd Dell,[2]quotes Professor Isabel Davenport[3] as saying that

> ----" the training of girls for their legitimate inheritance of marriage and motherhood, and their responsibilities and rights in connection with all that these imply ---- comprehends not merely a pubertal and adolescent training aimed toward making girls physically and mentally fit for maternity and wifehood, but it strikes at the very roots of the girl child's treatment, and the social attitude toward her, form the day she is born. It comprehends not only the training of adolexcent girls (and boys) into a favorable attitude toward marriage, but the whole broad subject of the conventions and practical relations between the sexes in everyday life - in home and education, in work and play, from infancy on. It comprehends not merely training girls and boys to save a marriage fund, and to work out the problem of the maintenance of a home and the support of children together, but it involves the working out of a new type of home life and child care, suitable to a new industrial and economic age."

1. Ernest Rutherford Groves, in George A. Bartlett, op.cit.,p.62.
2. Love in the Machine Age.p.
3. Salvaging of American Girlhood, pp. 247,257,258.

To this preparation for successful family life, sociology, psychology and psychiatry can contribute. To deal with child problems there are: the psychopathic clinic for the youthful offender, the pre-school child clinic, the habit clinic, and the nursery school. To serve the adult, there are: the mental hygiene movement, the psychopathic clinic, industrial psychology, and to some extent the court of family relations.[1] Now and then one hears of "doctors of matrimony" and marriage clinics, although they are confined largely to college professors who are interested in the welfare of the home sufficiently to give of their valuable time for its improvement. Perhaps in time marriage clinics will be common.[2]

Education for marriage will help to solve the divorce evil. The problem of divorce will not be solved by making divorce easier or more difficult but by giving men and women a better chance "to achieve the matrimonial success for which they hunger."[3] Until human nature changes radically for the better, divorce must continue. Those who say that it is wrong do not have the right conception of marriage. Marriage at the outset is a civil contract and not a sacrament. Its sacredness lies in the harmony of the two people, and that is a growing thing. Time will tell whether a marriage was made in heaven. Whom God has joined together, man cannot put asunder; but God does not always do the joining.[4]

One cannot discuss the question of divorce without speaking of one of the very evident evils attending it in this country, - the evil of publicity. Intimate and spiritual

1. Ernest Rutherford Groves, The Marriage Crises, p. 198.
2. Ernest Rutherford Groves, The Marriage Crises, p. 188
3. George A. Bartlett, op. cit., p
4. See George K. Pratt, "Doctors of Matrimony", Survey Graphic, January 1932, pp. 359-360, 398-400.

affairs are handled with no more privacy than a money matter. The public takes a morbid interest in facts of private life. Not only are the persons affected psychologically, but health, future, business, financial standing and friendships are often swept away by the publicity attending an affair which really concerns only two persons. Private affairs should be handled privately.

It will be observed that most of the work of the above-mentioned agencies deals with trouble after it has begun; that is, it has to do with what Groves calls, "the drifting home."1 Increasingly greater emphasis however is being placed upon prevention. It must be remembered that education for marriage, because it is so intimately concerned with personalities, cannot proceed by any rule of three. There are as many marriage problems as there are men and women who marry. To a large extent, each marriage is a separate problem. However, each marriage may profit by what has been learned from others, and each may be guided by certain principles that apply to all.

Summary

Marriage has passed from the polygamous to the monogamous stage and from there to the paternal. In primitive cultures and in the most ancient civilizations, woman had a great deal of power. For economic reasons however power passed from the wife to the husband, until, in the Roman Empire, the father was the supreme authority in the home. Gradually, the power of the pater potestas was decreased. Christianity

1. See book by that name.

contributed to this change. Early Christianity, while it sought to develop the gentler virtues, was also harmful in its effects because it preached the sinfulness of sex.

Before the Industrial Revolution, industry was centered in the home. The wife and mother made a large economic contribution. The Industrial Revolution took women and children out of the home. It caused the rapid growth of cities, and city life is unfriendly to the family. The Industrial Revolution had the effect also of creating a group of parasitic women. The capitalist preferred to support his wife in leisure. Education for women however has made it possible for them to be the equal of men. Sweeping away religious restraints has hastened the process. As a result, today, individualism finds one of its chief expressions in the emancipated woman.

Individualism has decreased parental authority and family loyalty. It has gone hand in hand with specialization, taking away from the home many of its former functions. For two reasons individualism has decreased the size of families. People marry later in life than formerly, and they voluntarily restrict the size of families.

Russia is an illustration of extreme individualism. One of the principles of Bolshevism is that all men and women must have absolutely equal opportunity and equal responsibility in society and before the law. Russia has made marriage and divorce easy. It has done away with the illegitimate child. The Soviet marriage and divorce laws have their advantages and disadvantages. While one is tempted sometimes to condemn the system because of the inevitable grief it brings, one wonders if that is not more than balanced by the contributions Russia

has made to human living. After all, progress comes only by sacrifice.

There are those who say that the family is disappearing. It will not disappear. It has too many resources on which to rely. It has the resources of sex, of children, of companionship, and of affection. The family is the principle burden-bearer of all our social institutions. It is the place where one can"be himself."

With all these resources, it is worthwhile that society endeavor to make family life happy. It must be made possible economically for individuals to marry young. The emancipation of women should help to bring this desired condition. Employed women are in a financial position to help establish a home; moreover, they realize the value of money and are better able to adjust themselves to standards their husbands can afford. In order to make family life happy, there must be education for family life. This education must include not only the mechanical aspect of home life but also the finer aspect of living together. Happy family life means a harmony of individual attitudes. It means the organization of attitudes and ideals for a common purpose. Education for that aspect of family life will be difficult, but it will be eminently worth while.

VII

Conclusion

The family has undergone radical changes; it has been the subject of as much criticism, perhaps, as any one social institution. Those changes, it has been pointed out, are the results of individualism. Individualism has meant the emancipation of women. It has meant specialization, which has taken from the home most of the functions which formerly it performed. The radical group views the changing family as an indication that the family will disappear, and they advocate free love as a means of hastening the process. It is well for such people to remind themselves of the functions which the family still serves.

The family is the first environment in which a person finds himself, and it is the portal through which he enters society. It is in that early environment that basic attitudes toward self and associates are fixed. It is there that human mature gets its first shaping, and the place where those virtues and controls needed for successful living together are acquired. Religious life is first developed in the family; political ideals and cultural standards are learned. In brief, it is within the family that a person's life gets the direction it will take; it is the place where the sails are set.[1]

The other great purpose which the family serves has to do not with the children but with the two individuals who marry. It is a means of expression of normal sex life. Marriage makes sex life respectable. The satisfaction of the sex

1. Joyce Hertzler, op. cit., p. 435.

urge becomes "a refined ecstacy of delight that becomes more happy and noble through the years. ---- No adult reaches his full spiritual stature without mating and natural fruition."[1] For persons who are happily mated, marriage offers one of the highest forms of self-expression.

Those who advocate free love with its accompanying institutional care of children are ignoring the values that come to the child from his long period of dependence on parents, and the opportunities for expression which the family gives. Regarding mass-maternity, which is found to a certain extent in Russia, someone has said:

> "The danger of such an organization, of which we have the beginnings in our schools, is that it may fail to develop the spiritual side of the child. ---- It is conceivable that, in the earlier stages of 'mass-maternity' for children, the individual child may be neglected. Outwardly, the individual is on a par with all the others, inwardly, it possess only a latent gentleness, unselfishness, amiability, tolerance, kindness."[2]

After all the great thinkers have expressed their views on the matter of institutional care of children, the question may be settled by asking the child in the institution.

The acvocates of free love do not realize what a serious wrench it is to society and to the members of a family to have a family broken. Moreover, there is no guarantee that free love will make for greater happiness. People will have the same disagreeable qualities they have at present; and there will be no marriage bond to act as a check on the individual's unpleasant nature.

Dr. J. A. Hadfield, in his book Psychology and Morals, (New York: Robert M. McBride and Company, 1929, pp. 140-141),

1. Ibid, p. 436.
2. George A. Bartlett, op. cit., p. 196.

has demonstrated, from the psychological and historical point of view, why free love is unsatisfactory. Keep in mind what has been said previously in the development of the family.

> "The problem of 'free love' and 'marital fidelity' is not ---- a question of nature against moral convention. The real conflict is between an earlier phase of evulution and a later phase, the polygamous and the monogamous, both of which have left their impression in our psychology. ---- The man who lives polygamously is not living 'according to nature,' as he imagines: he has simply failed to keep pace with nature. He has been arrested in his development, which should have progressed from the polygamous to the monogamous, and from this to the paternal phase. If, then, an appeal is made to nature, it must be to the whole of nature, and not merely to its lower and earlier manifestations. ----The life of the savage is often called 'simple.' In outward organization it may be, but psychologically it is far more chaotic than the ordered life of civilized man, whose instinctive forces are directed to a common purpose. So it is with the individual who permits unrestrained expression to his impulses, for he finds no peace in life."

The alarmist group centers its attention on the increase in the number of divorces and, going to the opposite extreme from the stand taken by the advocates of free love, they advocate a tightening of the divorce laws. They are ignorant of the facts. It is easy to migrate from a state having strict laws to one having liberal laws. Only 20% of the divorces granted in Reno are given to natives of the state. New York State allows one cause, and a condition of almost legalized concubinage has resulted. It has created "the necessity of regulating, by statute, how large a proportion of his property a married man may give to his 'affinity'"[1]

Neither can the divorce evil be cured by making divorce laws uniform. To be sure they are in need of revision and moderate unification all over the world. They are unrelated to modern civilization, and their diversity has created ridiculous

1. George A. Bartlett, op. cit., p. 44.

situations both in international and in state divorce cases. But this reform must not come from the church or from any radical reform group; rather, it must come through the broad consideration of all ages and kinds of men and women. In the United States, divorce cannot be handled by the federal government. No question of so personal a nature can be arbitrated centrally. Different sections take on special sectional color, due to local human qualities which differ from those of other sections. There is perjury and collusion in State divorce: there would be more in national. It is education and not legislation that will gradually modify and standardize marriage and divorce.

It is very evident that changes are desirable if the family is to function successfully in modern life. There must be legislation to eliminate some of the worst conditions that threaten marriage. There must be fairer legislation for the illegitimate child. There must be eugenic marriage laws. There must be an economic adjustment which will make it possible for young people to marry at an earlier age than is now possible. There must be education for marriage and parenthood, and in this education stress must be laid upon the necessity of a proper attitude toward marriage.

The rest of the world needs most of the reforms which have been introduced in Russia; but the world cannot subscribe either to the method used for attaining these reforms or to the ultimate aims of the Soviet Government. "The roots of the family strike so deep into the underlying strata of social history that to uproot it would mean the uprooting and destruction of

every other recognized social institution."[1] Marriage is more difficult today, but if offers a richer comradeship than ever before. No matter what changes the years may bring, the relations between men and women will remain. "It is that relation, with the love or hate it entails, which marks the faces of all the world today."[2] The institution of the family must be saved. The world still expects and needs family life as the normal portion of the great majority of the people.

1. Joyce Hertzler, Social Progress, p. 443.
2. George A. Bartlett, Men, Women and Conflict, p. 286.

Bibliography

Note: In this bibliography, *** mark those references which were read entire; ** mark those in which all that pertain to the subject of this thesis were read; and * marks those books to which reference was made.

Books.

*** Bartlett, George A., Men, Women and Conflict, New York: Putnam, 1931.

* Bosanquet, Helen, The Family, New York: Macmillan, 1915.

*** Briffault, Robert, The Mothers, IV. ed. Macmillan, 1931.

** Chamberlain, William Henry, Soviet Russia, Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1930.

* Dell, Floyd, Love in the Machine Age. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1930.

** Eddy, Sherwood, The Challenge of Russia, New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1931.

*** Farbman, Michael, Piatiletka: Russia's Five Year Plan, New York: New Republic, Inc. 1931.

** Field, Alice Withrow, Protection of Women and Children in Soviet Russia. New York; Dutton, 1932.

** Gillin, John Lewis, Colbert, Roy L. Dittmer, Clarence G., Social Problems, New York: Century, 1928.

*** Goodsell, Willystine, Problems of the Family. New York: Century, 1928.

* Groves, Ernest Rutherford and Ogburn, William Fielding, American Marriage and Family Relationships. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1928.

** Groves, Ernest Rutherford, The Drifting Home. Boston: Houghton, 1926.

* Groves, Ernest Rutherford, Introduction to Sociology. New York: Longman's, Green and Company, 1918.

* Groves, Ernest Rutherford, The Marriage Crisis. New York: Longman's, Green and Company, 1928.

* Hamilton, G. V. and MacGowan, Kenneth, What is Wrong with Marriage. New York: Albert and Charles Boni, 1929.

** Hertzler, Joyce, Social Progress. New York: Century 1928.

** Hindus, Maurice, The Russian Peasant and the Revolution. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1920.

** Hindus, Maurice, Humanity Uprooted. New York: Johnathan Cape and Harrison Smith, 1929.

* London, George, Red Russia After Ten Years. Trans. from the French by G. E. R. Gedye, New York: Dutton, 1928.

** Mowrer, Ernest R., Family Disorganization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.

*** Nearing, Scott, Glimpses of the Soviet Republic. New York: Social Science Publishers, 1926.

*** Llin, H., New Russia's Primer: The Story of the Five-Year Plan. Trans. by George S. Counts and Nucia P. Lodge. Boston: Houghton, 1931.

* Reuter, Edward Byron and Runner, Jessie Ridgway, ed., The Family: Source Material for the Study of Family and Personality New York: McGraw, Hill Book Co., Inc., 1931.

* Rich, Margaret, ed., Family Life Today. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1928.

** Smith, Jessica, Women in Soviet Russia. New York: Vanguard Press, 1928.

*** Strong, Anna Louise, Marriage and Morals in Soviet Russia. Girard, Kansas: Halderman-Julius Publications, 1927.

* Westermarck, Edward, The History of Human Marriage, 5th.ed. rewritten. London; Macmillan, 1921.

Periodicals.

*** Bliven, Bruce, "Russia in Hope," The New Republic. LXIX (December 2, 1931), pp. 60-62.

*** Bliven, Bruce, "Religion and Love in Russia," The New Republic, LXIX (December 23, 1931), pp.

*** Borders, Karl, "Social Work in the Soviet Union," Social Service Review. June 1931, pp. 237-245.

*** Burgess, Ernest W. "The Romantic Impulse and Family Disorganization," Survey Graphic, December 1926, pp. 290-294.

*** "Can Romance Sustain Marriage," Christian Century, October 21, 1931.

*** Colcord, Joanna, "Community of Interest as a Basis for Family Solidarity," Social Forces, June 1928, pp. 577-579.

*** Fiske, Bishop Charles, "Marriage - Tempory or Permanent," Atlantic Monthly, September 1926, pp. 303-311.

*** Fosdick, Harry Emerson, "What is Happening to the American Family," Journal of Social Hygiene, XV (March 1931), pp.138-143.

*** Hindus, Maurice, "A White Wedding," Asia, XXXO (May 1931), pp. 290-293, 337-338.

*** Hinkle, Beatrice M., "Changing Marriage: A By-Product of Industrialism," Survey Graphic, December 1926,pp.286-289.

*** Hoffman, Frederick L., "Marriage and Divorce," Journal of Social Hygiene, XV (March 1929), pp. 130-135.

*** Lublinsky, Paul, "Marriage and Divorce in Soviet Russia," The Family, X (March 3, 1929), pp. 28-31.

*** Pratt, George K., "Doctors of Matrimony," Survey Graphic," January 1932, pp. 359-360, 398-400.

*** Thompson, Dorothy (Mrs. Sinclair Lewis), "Moral Chaos in Soviet Russia," The American Scrap Book. New York: William Wise and Company, 1928.pp. 100-102.

*** Williams, Frankwood E., "Those Crazy Russians," Survey Graphic, January 1932, pp. 341-345.

*** Woodhouse, Chase Goint, "Does Money Make the Marriage Go?" Survey Graphic, January 1931, pp. 355-358.

Bulletins.

*** Russia in Transition: An American Symposium. New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1925.